

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. III.

APRIL, 1899.

No. 2.

## Doctrinal Theology.

### COSMOLOGY.

(Continued.)

#### ANTHROPOLOGY.

God created man in his own image.<sup>1)</sup> The creation of man was a part, the closing part, of the six days' work of creation. On the day of which the inspired record says, "And the evening and the morning was the sixth day,"<sup>2)</sup> God, according to the same account, created man.<sup>3)</sup> Man is not a product of spontaneous generation, not a result of a long continued process of evolution, but a distinct work of God, made at a definite period of time, and not a rudimentary work, but a complete and finished work.<sup>4)</sup> This work of God was from that first day of its existence *man*, not a cell, a microbe, a saurian, an ape, but man, created according to the will and counsel of God. It was the triune God who said, "*Let us make MAN*,"<sup>5)</sup> and God created *MAN*.<sup>6)</sup> As the human individual, even in its embryonic state is at all times essentially human, so the human race never passed through a state of brute existence or through

1) Gen. 1, 27: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

2) Gen. 1, 31.

3) Gen. 1, 27.

4) Gen. 2, 1. 2.

5) Gen. 1, 26.

6) Gen. 1, 27.

a process of development from an earlier, inferior, to a later, superior state, before he was man. Man as he came from his Maker's hand on the day of his creation was an *intelligent* being, to whom the dressing and keeping of a garden could be entrusted,<sup>1)</sup> who had notions of things and their relations, thoughts and combinations of thoughts, the power of reasoning and of intelligent speech.<sup>2)</sup> And man was from the first day of his existence a *moral* being, endowed with the faculty of applying an ethical norm.<sup>3)</sup> Nor were these qualities in man potentially only in his mind, to be developed by growth or education and example. Man was not only created physically mature, capable of the performances of an adult individual,<sup>4)</sup> but his mental and moral faculties were also at once of a high order in kind and degree. His understanding penetrated the nature of the things he saw, not after long continued observation and study, but promptly and at first sight he named the objects that were led before him.<sup>5)</sup> His moral sense was at once ready to be called into action,<sup>6)</sup> and for his acts of disobedience committed soon after his creation God and his own conscience held him responsible.<sup>7)</sup>

---

1) Gen. 2, 15: "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it."

2) Gen. 2, 19. 20. 23. 24.

3) Gen. 2, 16. 17: "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

4) Gen. 1, 27. 28: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Gen. 2, 15. See above.

5) Gen. 2, 19. 20. 23. 24.

6) Gen. 2, 16. 17. See above.

7) Gen. 3, 7—10: "And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons. And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves

All this is, of course, in flat contradiction with all the various fictions which are in our day paraded as scientific theories based upon the hypotheses of an inferior state of primitive man, fictions which are as unscientific as they are unscriptural and antiscritptural. There never was such a period as a Stone Age of the human race in the natural history of mankind—unless we consider that period as continuing to this day—, and there is nothing in the world to prove that the cliff builders and cromlech builders and mound builders belong to a prehistoric age. In fact, that prehistoric age is, like prehistoric man, itself a fiction. The beginning of the history of man is clearly and explicitly written in the book of Genesis, and the record of the rocks, the history of our race written in the book of nature, has been grossly misinterpreted. Pottery found under deposits of Nile alluvium, declared to have been formed long before the historic period, was, on closer observation or examination, shown to have been turned out of Roman workshops, and the computations of geologists and archaeologists have been so often put to shame, that even the credulity of modern unbelief is no longer at ease under the searchlights of careful investigation.

Another antiscritptural assumption hopelessly exploded and untenable even in the light of scientific induction is that primeval man was androgynous. Man was not created a monstrosity, but the first human being was a male person, and on the same day with the first man a second human being, a mature female person, woman, was made.<sup>1)</sup> The sexes are not a result of gradual differentiation, but *in the beginning*, when God made the first ancestors of our race, he *made them male and female.*<sup>2)</sup>

---

from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the garden. And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou? And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself."

1) Gen. 1, 27. Matt. 19, 4. Gen. 2, 18. 21—24.

2) Matt. 19, 4.



At the same time, however, the human race had not a dual or plural origin, but its fountainhead is one, the first man, Adam. Out of Adam the substance was taken whereof God made the first woman.<sup>1)</sup> And thus was she bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh, and she was called נִשְׂאָה, *woman*, because she was taken from אָדָם, *man*, a being different in sex but alike in substance and of the same nature.

In the nature of the first man and, hence, of the first woman, there were two distinct constituent parts, a material part, the body, and an immaterial part, the soul. The substance of Adam's body was taken from the earth, the dust of the ground,<sup>2)</sup> and formed into an organism by a creative act of God.<sup>3)</sup> In the continuation of this creative act God created the human soul, but not as in separate and independent existence without the body, to be afterwards united with the body, but by *breathing* and *thus* creating it into the material organism he had made, thus *making*, not the body, but *man, a living soul*.<sup>4)</sup> Adam was not created as two beings, afterwards united into one, but as one creature consisting of two elements, which together constituted one complete human person. From this first human person God then took the substance of a second human person. This was not a chirurgical operation, as a surgeon might perform, nor a generative act performed by Adam, but a creative act of God, who, taking one of the ribs of Adam with the life that was in it, made it a woman, body and soul, a

1) Gen. 2, 21. 22.

2) Gen. 2, 7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Gen. 3, 19: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." 1 Cor. 15, 47: "The first man is of the earth, earthy." Eccl. 12, 7: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

3) Gen. 2, 7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Cf. Gen. 1, 27.

4) Gen. 2, 7.

second living soul, another complete human person of the same nature with the first, but differing from the first, as woman differs from man.

Such, then, is man in his composite nature, a mysterious unit composed of matter and spirit, body and soul, no less, no more. No less, whatever theories materialists and pantheists may have advanced in earlier days or advance to-day. No more, whatever trichotomists may object by pointing out a series of texts which distinguish *spirit* and *soul*, πνεῦμα and ψυχή,<sup>1)</sup> passages which only view the spiritual element in man under different aspects, not as different substances or entities, but as the same subject asserting or manifesting itself in different spheres of life and activity. Through the Old and the New Testaments שֶׁמַּח and רוּחַ, ψυχή and πνεῦμα, are used promiscuously as interchangeable terms. Thus the same affections, as joy, sorrow, anguish, are ascribed to soul and spirit alike,<sup>2)</sup> and that part of our nature which is separated from the body in temporal death to be with the Lord thenceforth is named spirit and soul.<sup>3)</sup> Through the Old and the New Testaments man is looked upon as consisting of body and

*spirit & soul*

1) Luke 1, 46. 47: "And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Savior." 1 Thess. 5, 23: "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Hebr. 4, 12: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Luke 10, 27: "And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself."

2) Ps. 35, 9; Ps. 17, 23; Ps. 51, 14; Ps. 143, 12; Ps. 51, 19; Ps. 6, 4. Gen. 41, 8. Ps. 42, 6. John 12, 27; John 13, 21.

3) Hebr. 12, 23: "To the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect." Rev. 6, 9: "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held."



soul or spirit, the material and the immaterial element of his nature.<sup>1)</sup> Dichotomy is, likewise, the only theory which agrees with the record of man's creation.

From this record of creation it further appears that the first man and the first woman were, according to the plan of creation, designated to be the first ancestors of the whole human race. The institution of matrimony was part of the order of things established by the Creator before the work of creation was finished. Not man alone, not woman alone, but man and woman received the divine blessing, "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth." By the union of one man and one woman the propagation of the human race was ordained, and this divine ordinance was intended to remain in force for all time. It was thus understood by Adam when God himself joined him and Eve in wedlock.<sup>2)</sup> Extra-connubial or polygamous intercourse of the sexes is, therefore, not in accordance with, but a violation of, the order established in the beginning, wherein and according to which the preservation and propagation of man should be secured. And likewise the union of man and woman rendered unfruitful by the prevention of offspring, whereby the divine blessing pronounced over the ancestors of mankind and their progeny is frustrated, is also a violation of what God ordained in the beginning and for all time.

But here the question presents itself: What was to be propagated by the union of man and woman? Man, being himself a living soul by creation, was to beget living souls by propagation,<sup>3)</sup> after God had finished his work of creation by immediate action, *ex nihilo*,<sup>4)</sup> to continue it by mediate action through second causes, the parents, as the progenitors of their offspring. When our first ancestors

1) Ps. 73, 26; Ps. 84, 4. Eccl. 12, 7. Matt. 10, 28. 1 Cor. 6, 13. Eph. 4, 4.

2) Gen. 2, 24: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh."

3) Gen. 1, 22; Gen. 1, 28.

4) Gen. 2, 1—3.

were blessed that they should be fruitful and multiply, it was to increase the number of beings of their kind. They were to propagate not only the body but the entire nature of which they were the first representatives. We are nowhere told in the Scriptures that God created a multitude of souls to be in their time united with the bodies to be supplied by propagation, and we are expressly told that God had completed his work of creation at the end of the six days and before the day when he rested from all the work that he had made.<sup>1)</sup> While these statements exclude the theory of the preexistence of souls and the creation theory, they do not deny the creation of all human individuals, not only potentially considered, as they were all created in Adam as the fountainhead of the human race, but also individually, inasmuch as they come into being by virtue of the word by which God blessed our first parents, saying, "*Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth.*" In this sense, by mediate action, God has made of one blood all nations of men.<sup>2)</sup> In this sense we say with the small Catechism, "I believe that God has made me and all creatures, has given me my body and soul, eyes and ears," etc., for in this same sense God says, "*I have formed thee in the belly,*"<sup>3)</sup> and the Psalmist, "*Thou hast covered me (knit me together) in my mother's womb. I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvelous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well.*"<sup>4)</sup> Since, however, the intermediate causes, man and woman, are now contaminated with sin, which permeates their entire nature, the children, though God's handiwork, are not created holy, as man was in his primeval state, but partake of the fallen state of their progenitors.<sup>5)</sup>

Thus the entire human race is one family, descended from one common ancestor, not a variety of races, sprung

1) Gen. 2, 1—3. See above.

2) Acts 17, 24. 26.

3) Jer. 1, 5.

4) Ps. 139, 13. 14.

5) Gen. 5, 3.



from various first ancestors and clustering around various creative centers.<sup>1)</sup> The children to-day inherit from their parents the nature which God created in the beginning when he made Adam, though no longer in its primitive state.

#### PRIMEVAL STATE OF MAN.

Man, as all the creatures of God, was created good, very good.<sup>2)</sup> Yet all creatures were not made alike. There was one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars, and one star differed from the other star in glory.<sup>3)</sup> And each creature was made after its kind.<sup>4)</sup> But man was distinguished from and above all other creatures on the face of the earth by a manner of excellence peculiar to him alone. While plants and animals were made each after its kind,<sup>5)</sup> man was made after the image of God.<sup>6)</sup> Man was made, not a God or semi-God, but essentially *man*, consisting of two elements, body and soul, not of three, body, soul, and the image of God. The counsel of God was not, "Let us make our image and likeness," and the creative act of God is not described in words as, "So God created his image, man." God created man *in* his image *after* his likeness. When God breathed into the nostrils of the first human body the breath of life, this was not an emanative act, whereby God had communicated himself, his essence, to the work of his hands, but a creative act, whereby God produced *ex nihilo* the human soul in personal union with the body, which he formed of the dust of the ground. And by this entire creative process God made man after his likeness. But while the image of God

1) Acts 17, 26. Rom. 5, 12 ff.

2) Gen. 1, 31.

3) 1 Cor. 15, 41: "There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differeth from another star in glory." Gen. 1, 16: "And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also."

4) Gen. 1, 4. 12. 18. 21. 25. 31.

5) Gen. 1, 11. 21. 24. 25.

6) Gen. 1, 26. 27.



was not of the essence of man's nature, it was not a gift bestowed upon man after his creation, not a *donum super-additum*, as a diadem on the head of a monarch or a chaplet on the brow of a bride, but a concreated quality. God did not say, "Let us *give unto* man our image and *bestow* upon man our likeness," but "Let us *make* man in our image after our likeness;" and, accordingly, God *created* man in his image, in the image of God *created* he him.<sup>1)</sup> Thus man, after the loss of God's image, was still essentially man, not a brute or a monster; and yet the loss of the divine image did not leave man *in puris naturalibus*. Man not only *had* no longer what he *had* before the fall, but he *was* no longer as he *was* before the fall. Man after the fall was still *what* he had been before the fall, but not *as* he had been, no longer in his primeval state.

What, then, was the image of God in which man was created? For an answer to this question we must not look to the physiology or psychology of natural man as now constituted under sin. The image of God, being a concreated endowment of primeval man, would certainly have been transmitted with the nature of our first parents to their offspring by natural propagation, just as sin, which is likewise not of the essence of human nature, is yet propagated in our sinful nature as hereditary sin. Since the image of God was lost, Adam begat children not in the likeness of God, in which he was created,<sup>2)</sup> but in his own likeness, after his image,<sup>3)</sup> and it is evidently for the sake of contrast that the two statements are here placed in such close proximity. What Adam transmitted to his children was not

1) Gen. 1, 26. 27. Gen. 5, 1: "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him." James 3, 9: "Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God."

2) Gen. 5, 1: "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him."

3) Gen. 5, 3: "And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth."

the image and likeness of God. It is only by a renewal, by which man is made a new creature, *καινή κτίσις*,<sup>1)</sup> a new man, *καινός ἄνθρωπος*,<sup>2)</sup> that the image of Him that created him can be restored to man. Hence nothing that is in natural man can be of the image of God. The upright body and the rational soul with its human understanding, affections and will, while wofully deteriorated and in various ways and degrees corrupt in consequence of sin, are still the constituent elements of human nature, and, therefore, must not be considered as constituting the divine image or a part thereof. Conscience, too, the religious and moral sense in man, and the moral law inscribed in the human heart, whereby man is distinguished from brutes in his present state, can not be subsumed under the image of God. The image of God is, in short, nothing whereby man is man as distinguished from inferior creatures, but it is that whereby man was in conformity with God, though being man and not God. The divine image in man was a true reflection of God in the entire nature, especially the intellectual and moral nature of man. Thus the terms *image* and *glory*, *εἰκὼν* and *δόξα*, of God are used conjointly in the Scriptures.<sup>3)</sup> There was in primeval man a true and thorough knowledge, *ἐπίγνωσις*, of God, which was lost in the fall, but is from day to day being restored to the regenerate in the *ἀνακαινώσις*, the renewal of the image of God,<sup>4)</sup> and when that image shall have been completely renewed in us, "*we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.*"<sup>5)</sup> As holiness is the absolute conformity of God with his divine nature, so the image of God in primeval man was holiness, the conformity of man and all his qualities and faculties with God, of man's will with the will of God, his affections with the corresponding attributes of God,

1) 2 Cor. 5, 17.      2) Col. 3, 10. Eph. 4, 24.      3) 1 Cor. 11, 7.

4) Col. 3, 10: "And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him."

5) 1 John 3, 3.



the integrity and purity of his body and soul with the integrity and purity of God. And thus the renewal of the image of God is sanctification, ἁγιασμός, the putting on of *the new man, which after God is created in RIGHTEOUSNESS and true HOLINESS.*<sup>1)</sup> Here the new man is said to be created κατὰ θεόν, *secundum deum* (as κατὰ Ἰσαάκ, *like Isaac*<sup>2)</sup>), *in the likeness of God*, inasmuch as it is created in righteousness and true holiness. And this accords with the will of God as stated by St. Peter, saying, "*As he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation.*"<sup>3)</sup> Thus also where we are reminded of having put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created us,<sup>4)</sup> the preceding and subsequent context is an extended exhortation to sanctification, to put off all uncleanness and to put on holiness.<sup>5)</sup> And, finally, those in whom the divine image is fully restored<sup>6)</sup> are briefly described as *just men made perfect.*<sup>7)</sup> Juvenal's ideal of man was *Mens sana in corpore sano.*<sup>8)</sup> Our aim is higher, the restoration of the divine image, *mens sancta in corpore sancto.*

The possession of the fully restored image of God in the future state of man will, however, differ in one point from the possession of the concreated image of God in man's primeval state. The future state of man will be a state of confirmed holiness. Man's first estate was not a state of *non posse peccare* and *non posse mori*,<sup>9)</sup> but a state of *posse non peccare* and *posse non mori*. This was not a defect in man, as it is not a defect in a child to be child and not an adult. What the manner of man's translation into a confirmed state of holiness and bliss would have been, if he had

1) Eph. 4, 23. 24.

3) 1 Pet. 1, 15.

5) Col. 3, 5—4, 6.

7) Hebr. 12, 23.

8) "Orandum est, ut sit mens sana in corpore sano." Sat. X, 356.

9) Gen. 2, 17.

2) Gal. 4, 28.

4) Col. 3, 10.

6) 1 Cor. 15, 49. 1 John 3, 2.

not fallen, we can not know. What we know is that by Christ's redemption we have gained more than we have lost in Adam.<sup>1)</sup>

A consequence of the possession of the image of God in man's primeval state was a blissful communion with God, with whom he lived in perfect peace,<sup>2)</sup> and the absence of everything which might embarrass or abash man in his intercourse with God and man.<sup>3)</sup> In his state of innocence, man, furthermore, lived in the enjoyment of perfect health of body and soul without a germ or natural liability to disease and death.<sup>4)</sup> He had and exercised dominion over the inferior creatures.<sup>5)</sup> Though not a life of indolence, but of useful employment,<sup>6)</sup> his life was not to be burdensome, loaded down with sorrow and onerous toil, which it was after the fall.<sup>7)</sup>

#### THE FALL.

Man, like the angels that are now evil angels, did not keep his first estate. How it was possible that man, being good, endowed with perfect righteousness and holiness, should fall and become evil, thoroughly evil in every imagination of the thoughts of his heart,<sup>8)</sup> we do not know. We know that his fall was not a matter of necessity, not of coercion on the part of God, but of free choice on the part of man. It was God's will that man, whom he had created very good, should remain very good, and that man should multiply and replenish the earth in the full enjoyment of

---

1) 2 Cor. 3, 18: "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord."

2) Gen. 2, 18 ff.; cf. Gen. 3, 8 ff.

3) Gen. 2, 25: "And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed." Gen. 3, 7: "And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons."

4) Gen. 2, 17.

5) Gen. 1, 28; Gen. 2, 19. 20.

6) Gen. 2, 15.

7) Gen. 3, 16—19.

8) Gen. 6, 5.



his primeval excellence and of such blessings as God might have conferred upon him afterwards.<sup>1)</sup> The fall was not a development, but a perversion, of human nature. This perversion received its first impulse not from within but from without, not from human nature but from a fallen creature. But while it was Satan who prompted man to fall, it was man who fell, being tempted as a rational being with an intellect and will of his own.

Woman was the last creature whom God had made, and she, too, was very good.<sup>2)</sup> She had been created to be a helpmeet to Adam, because it was not good for man to be alone.<sup>3)</sup> And thus the relation which the Creator established between man and woman was also very good. The conjugal relation was not a weak point in the work of creation, and connubial intercourse was not the fall. We do not read that such intercourse took place before the expulsion of our first parents from Paradise;<sup>4)</sup> and if it had it would have been within the divine ordinance and in conformity with the will of God, not sin, but a work of righteousness.

Yet it is remarkable that Satan in his attempt to work the ruin of mankind selected woman as the first object of temptation. What it was that led the tempter to proceed as he did is nowhere stated; but his success certainly proved the astuteness of the evil spirit,<sup>5)</sup> and whether or not this was in accordance with his calculation, he certainly reached Adam and accomplished his fall by working the fall of Eve, her husband's cherished spouse. Adam, cleaving unto his wife, left, not his father and mother, but his God; and thus, too, the fall was a perversion of that which God had made and established.

---

1) Gen. 1, 28.

2) Gen. 1, 31.

3) Gen. 2, 18.

4) Gen. 4, 1: "And Adam knew Eve, his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord."

5) Gen. 3, 1.

There is one circumstance which may have seemed to recommend his point of attack to the tempter. To the moral law inscribed in man's heart, God had added a positive law. The injunction of abstinence from the fruit of the forbidden tree had been imposed upon man before the creation of woman,<sup>1)</sup> and we do not hear that the prohibition was once more pronounced by God himself after she was made. It was probably through Adam that the woman learned the prohibition of the tree in the midst of the garden. This positive law has been very generally looked upon as a test whereby man should be made to undergo a probation, the event of which should decide his future lot. Others, the federal theologians, Cocceius, Turretin, and their followers, have even supposed a special covenant, which God had established with Adam, promising him eternal happiness on the condition of obedience, and the forbidden tree according to this theory appears as the divinely appointed criterion of man's faithfulness of carrying out his part of the terms of the established covenant. Of all this the Scriptures say nothing, and the special purpose for which God prohibited man from eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is, as the nature of the tree itself, a mystery to us. That Satan took advantage of this prohibition does not prove that it was intended for an opportunity to him for putting man to the test any more than the creation of woman proves that God intended her as a test object for a trial of man's fidelity to his Maker.

But when we come to determine the real point of attack astutely chosen by Satan we find that it was not the relation of man and woman, nor that of man and the forbidden tree, but the relation of man and God. This is indicated by the remarkable word wherewith God himself described what had come to pass in the fall of man, when he said, "*Behold the man is become as one of us.*"<sup>2)</sup> The relation which

---

1) Gen. 2, 16; coll. Gen. 2, 18 ff.

2) Gen. 3, 22.



God had established between himself and man was a relation of perfect harmony between the divine Creator and an intelligent, rational, moral creature, whose affections and will, as those of a being inferior to God, were to be in full accord with the superior will of God, not under coercion, but in free and joyful submission. This relation found a special expression in the positive commandment concerning the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, as a special enactment and utterance of the divine will. And thus it was at once a token of satanic malice and diabolical astuteness that the tempter chose as he did his first point of attack when he undertook to bring about the fall of man. "*Your iniquities have separated between you and your God,*" says Isaiah,<sup>1)</sup> and to separate between man and God was from the beginning Satan's endeavor. Satan's temptation was from the very outset calculated to induce man to place himself at variance with God, to assert his own will against the will of God, and to emancipate his affections from the superior norm imposed upon him by God's holiness. If man asserted himself as against God, and God in his holiness, according to which he is in energetic opposition to everything that is not in conformity therewith, asserted himself against man, the separation between God and man had been accomplished, the primeval relation of God and man had been disestablished. And this was Satan's aim.

With this object in view Satan indeed chose his measures with consummate subtility; and hence the narrative of the fall of man is fitly opened with the statement, "*And the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord had made.*"<sup>2)</sup> That the moral law, inscribed in man's heart, was in every way the rule of life conducive to man's well-being, that love, the love of God and his fellow-man, would prove a source of happiness to him, was in every way evident. But here was a positive law, which,

---

1) Is. 59, 2.

2) Gen.<sup>3</sup>, 1.

while it left man free to eat of every tree of the garden, enjoined him from eating of one particular tree under penalty of death. In his relation to God it was incumbent on man to trust to the wisdom and holiness of his Maker, to be fully persuaded that this enactment of the will of God tended to his benefit, and in willing obedience to conform himself with the will of God also in this particular case, even though God had reserved unto himself and his superior wisdom the peculiar reasons of such dispensation. To draw into question the propriety of this special commandment of God and to withhold his compliance therewith was rebellious self-assertion against God on the part of man, and not only an alteration, but a perversion, of his relation to God, whereby he would make his own the superior will and himself the superior, occupying the position which God could not but reserve to himself alone. To achieve this, Satan set in with impugning the validity and propriety of that one special commandment, changing and garbling it at the same time. While God had premised to his injunction the free permission to eat of every tree of the garden to indicate his goodness and kindness toward his creatures prior to the manifestation of his legislative majesty, Satan, reminding the woman of the divine commandment, employs a form calculated to obscure the goodness of God, saying, "*Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden,*" and thus forbearing to mention the permission and mentioning only the restriction, and that in an indefinite way. The questions which he evidently endeavored to rouse in the woman's mind were: "Why is it that God should withhold from us part of the blessings which we might enjoy? Why does he place his will between ourselves and a source of pleasure to us? Is this goodness and kindness toward his creatures? Can he mean what he says? And if, is he really disposed toward us as he would seem to be?" To suggest such questions and misgivings as these, Satan exhibited to the woman the divine commandment in its disfigured form, knowing



that each and every such question was, in fact, rebellion against God and a breaking away from the divinely established relation between God and man. But God had not only said in a different way what he had said, but he had also said more than the mere prohibition. He had also added the words, "*For in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die,*" and these words the tempter omits with an evident view of leading the woman to set aside the sovereign majesty of God manifested in that threat, while asserting her own dignity as infringed upon by the divine injunction.

Alas, from the manner of Eve's answer it would seem that Satan had with one fell blow brought our first mother to stagger or to fall, though for the moment she seems yet to cope with her assailant. She even seems to correct Satan in his recital of the divine commandment when she says, *We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden,*" and supplies what Satan has omitted when she continues, "*But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden God hath said, Thou shalt not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.*"<sup>1)</sup> But right here it should be noted that Eve also changes the word of God in a way which would indicate that Satan had indeed stirred up rebellion against the will of God in her heart. The words, "*Neither shall ye touch it,*" are not God's, but Eve's. Why should she add these words imposing a restriction of man's freedom which God had not made? To add to a law of God is just as truly sin as to take from it, a usurpation of that, which is God's exclusive prerogative, and the addition to the divine prohibition clearly indicates that Eve had been led to feel under undue constraint as concerning the forbidden tree. And if so, she was already in rebellion against God and therefore separated from God, a fallen creature, with sin in her heart, and sin in her members, first of all

---

1) Gen. 3, 2. 3.

in her tongue. Satan certainly appears emboldened by what he has heard the woman say. He now promptly and openly gives God the lie, saying, "*Ye shall not surely die,*" and openly and explicitly states what he has found implied in the woman's speech. "*God does know,*" says he, "*that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.*" He accuses God of withholding from Eve and her spouse what they might secure by eating of the tree in the midst of the garden. The divine injunction is here exhibited as a measure whereby man should be kept from a station within his reach, but denied him by a jealous God. Instead of indignantly resenting this blasphemous speech of the tempter, Eve, already under the growing influence of sin, permits the deadly malady conceived in her heart to permeate all her faculties and their organs. Her eyes are now sinful eyes, *seeing that the tree was good for food*, though God had declared that its fruit should not be eaten. Her affections are changed from their primeval rectitude. She derives pleasure from what she should have viewed with awe, and desires what she should have shunned, and seeing that the tree was pleasant to the eyes and to be desired to make one wise, she openly cast away all constraint and took of the fruit of the forbidden tree and did eat. Nor was that all. Having turned away from God, she unhesitatingly becomes an accomplice of the devil, a tempter and seducer like him. *She gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat*, having evidently gone through the entire process of alienation from God and rebellion against his holy will.<sup>1)</sup>

This, according to the divine record, was the genesis of sin and of the fall of man, the disruption and disestablishment of the primeval relation between man and God. Man, instead of confidently trusting in the goodness and wisdom of God and adhering to his word, and conforming

---

1) Gen. 3, 6.

himself to his will and seeking and finding the fulness of his bliss in such holy conformity with God, was led to seek superior bliss in himself and other creatures in inward and outward opposition to the will and word of God, and thus we may understand why it has been found difficult to determine the nature of the first rudiment of sin in the human heart, some describing it as selfishness, others as pride, still others as unbelief. Sin from the beginning did not consist in any of these transgressions singly and alone; nor did it consist merely in the setting aside of a positive law. The first sin was essentially the willful and fundamental disruption of the divinely established relation between man and God in all its various respects, man casting away his trust in God, the fear of God, the love of God, the filial spirit of obedience toward God, and thus breaking away from God and separating himself from his Creator, became an enemy of God, making himself his own god, of whom the Lord God said, "Behold, the man is become as one of us."

#### THE PENALTY OF SIN.

When the injunction concerning the forbidden tree was announced to our first parent, God said: "*In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*"<sup>1)</sup> In his primeval state man was a living soul in the full sense of the word. In his fallen state he was consigned to death in the full compass of the term. Death was not only to be the future lot of fallen man at the end of his mortal life, but the penalty which God had imposed upon the transgression of his law was to set in on the day of his first transgression, and there is no sufficient reason in the text or context to depart from the common meaning of the word *day*, in this connection. Neither are we by anything in the text or context led to restrict or weaken the meaning

---

1) Gen. 2, 17.



of the word *die* in the divine announcement of the penalty of sin. On the contrary, when God says מוֹת תָּמוּת, *thou shalt die the death*, or, *thou shalt surely die*, the emphatic form of the expression evidently indicates an energetic inauguration of the reign of death in the human race subsequent to man's transgression. This does not say that death should run its full course at once before the termination of the day of man's first transgression, or that all the various phases of death should at once appear in the fallen creature; but what the divine announcement of the penalty of sin clearly and expressly says is, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

The penalty of sin thus described was, then, not to be annihilation. Man was not, in consequence of the fall, to cease to be, to pass out of existence. His existence was not only to continue but also to continue as human existence. Fallen man was still essentially man, consisting of the constituent parts of his nature, body and soul, a human body and a human soul. Man by sin did not sink to or below the level of beasts. By sin man was not deprived of an intelligent mind, of understanding, reason, will, human affections, or anything essentially human. Fallen man was as truly man as he had been in his primeval state. And yet there was between that first estate and his fallen state a difference so vast, that a restoration could be wrought by God alone.

But as life is a mystery, so also death is a mysterious thing. Death is not the mere negation or absence of life. A stone or an iron statue is lifeless, but it is not dead in the proper sense of the word. Death presupposes a former state of life from which the subject has passed and which itself has passed away and can not be restored but by divine intervention. No power on earth can restore even a dead tree or worm to life. Death, then, is in one aspect a cessation of life within a living organism, an internal separation from that by which that organism was naturally deter-

mined from within itself. But inasmuch as life is sustained and invigorated by nourishment drawn from without, the separation of the living individual from that by which it is sustained will result in death. A tree uprooted from its proper soil, an animal shut off from light and air and food will die. Now, the sustaining principle of human life is God. In him we live and move and have our being.<sup>1)</sup> We live by the power of God.<sup>2)</sup> When Adam sinned his iniquity separated between him and his God,<sup>3)</sup>—and Adam died. Having sinned, he was now dead in sin.<sup>4)</sup> Living unto himself alone, he was dead while he lived.<sup>5)</sup>

Furthermore, death in man is more than death in a brute. Death in man is an execution of divine judgment over man's sins, a manifestation of divine wrath.<sup>6)</sup> Thus death, progressive death, was, in Adam, the beginning and continuation of the execution of divine judgment, the infliction of the penalty imposed upon man's first transgression. That first sinful act of man was sin not only on the day when it was committed, but stood before God and between man and God as sin, an act which could never be anything but sin. No power in heaven or earth, neither man, nor angel, nor God himself, could ever change that sin into righteousness or into something morally indifferent. Hence death as the penalty of sin could not be but eternal death. Anything less than that would have been incompatible with the eternal justice and holiness of God, even if the first transgression had remained the only sin to be dealt with. The reason why death, which actually set in when man had fallen, was not at once consummated through all its stages was this, that God in his goodness and mercy had a decree of redemption and a decree of predestination to execute in time and did not suffer sin to frustrate the designs of his benevolence and grace. In fact, on the very day

---

1) Acts 17, 28.

2) 2 Cor. 3, 14.

3) Is. 59, 2.

4) Eph. 2, 5.

5) 1 Tim. 5, 6.

6) Ps. 90, 7—11.

when death was come into the world and God in his judicial righteousness pronounced his just judgment over fallen mankind, he was already at hand with his saving grace and with a remedy against death, the precious gospel of the seed of the woman, who was to bruise the head of the serpent.

Death, then, was the penalty of sin. Death was not identical with sin. Man had committed sin, but man had not committed death. Sin was contrary to, and a violation of, the law; death was according to, and a vindication of, the law. Neither was death the natural consequence of sin or a product of the evolution of evil in man, not an evil fruit naturally growing on an evil tree, according to a law of nature. Death was not produced by sinful man, but a penalty inflicted by a righteous God. God did not and does not cause man to sin, but death came and comes upon man by the wrath of God,<sup>1)</sup> and thus, when death was inflicted upon the first transgressor, this was not a violation but an assertion of the righteousness of God.

That death, even eternal death, should be the penalty of sin is not only, as we have briefly shown, in full keeping with the nature of sin and with the righteousness of God, but also in full accord with the true nature of punishment and punitive justice. Of course, if the end and ultimate purpose of punishment were, as is widely claimed, the reformation of the sinner, then death, eternal death, would be the most improper punitive measure conceivable, and incompatible with the wisdom of God, according to which he employs the proper means to accomplish the proper ends. But such is not the nature and purpose of punishment. A penalty is not a bitter medicine administered to a patient to work a cure, but the infliction of just retribution upon the transgressor of the law to vindicate the majesty of the law and the lawgiver. Punitive justice is not determined by the amount of improvement of which the offender is in

---

1) Ps. 90, 3. 5. 7. 11.



need or capable, but the enormity of the offense committed and of the guilt thereby incurred. God in his justice does not say, "Chastisement is mine, I will reform the delinquent," but "VENGEANCE *is mine, I will REPAY,*"<sup>1)</sup> and of the persecutors of the church it is said: "*They have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink; FOR THEY ARE WORTHY.*"<sup>2)</sup> This is the nature of punitive justice everywhere. Even civil government when it metes out justice is *the minister of God, a REVENGER to execute WRATH upon him that DOETH EVIL.*<sup>3)</sup> That civil authorities, in dealing with criminals, also look to the protection of the community and its members is not due to the nature of justice but to the nature of civil government, *one* of whose purposes is to afford protection to society. Even a human judge is just in exercising what is called judicial clemency only when he considers mitigating circumstances to the crime whereby the degree of guilt is lessened, and to grant a pardon where punishment has been merited is not of the province of justice but of grace, and is very properly not a function of the judicial but of the executive branch of government. Besides, human administration of justice is imperfect. It is an approximate vindication of *crime* committed in violation of human laws, not an adequate vindication or just recompense<sup>4)</sup> of *sin*, committed in violation of divine law as such. And God does not say, "The cure of sin is death," but "*The WAGES of sin is death.*"<sup>5)</sup>

Again, however, the death of Adam was not death to him alone. Adam's death was the death of us all, even as Adam's sin was the sin of us all. Adam was in truth the fountainhead and representative of the entire human race. He was not only אָדָם, *a man*, but הָאָדָם, *the man*, both before the fall<sup>6)</sup> and after the fall.<sup>7)</sup> Adam's sin was, therefore,

1) Rom. 12, 19.

2) Rev. 16, 9.

3) Rom. 13, 4.

4) Hebr. 2, 2.

5) Rom. 6, 23.

6) Gen. 1, 27; 2, 7. 8. 15. 16. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 25.

7) Gen. 3, 8. 9. 12. 22; 4, 1.

not only the sin of a man, a human individual, but of man in general, of mankind, the human race, all of whose members existed substantially in their first ancestor, from whom all of them have their being, their nature, their fallen nature, which alone Adam could, and which alone he did, propagate.<sup>1)</sup> But even if Adam could have propagated his nature *in puris naturalibus*, without inherent sin, the first actual sin committed by him, for which the death penalty was imposed upon him, must have been imputed to all his children as their sin, committed in Adam, and this imputation actually took place. Adam had disobeyed God. That was his sin; but not his alone. *Διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, through the disobedience of that one man, Adam, the many were constituted sinners.*<sup>2)</sup> When? Not at the present time in their personal individual life and existence. Not at some future time in the final judgment. For *κατεστάθησαν* is neither present nor future, but the aoristic past. The many who were in Adam when he sinned were constituted sinners through that first act of disobedience at the time when it was committed. All the millions of Adam's children were accounted sinners, because in Adam they had as truly, though not in the same manner as if they had in individual personal existence transgressed the law of God, been implicated in an act of disobedience. Hence when judgment was passed over Adam because of the sin he had committed, that judgment led to condemnation, but not to the condemnation of Adam only. *Τὸ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα, the judgment, proceeding from one, resulted in condemnation.*<sup>3)</sup> Judgment and condemnation extended over Adam, the transgressor, but not over him alone. The Apostle does not say *ἐν ἑνί*, or *εἰς ἓνα*, but *ἐξ ἑνός*. The judgment and condemnation proceeded from Adam to his children and to all of them, not only because of their particular sins committed

---

1) Gen. 5, 3.

2) Rom. 5, 19.

3) Rom. 5, 16.

after the beginning of their personal lives, nor only because of their inherent sinfulness inherited from their immediate and remote ancestors, but because of the sin Adam had committed in Paradise. Δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατὰκριμα. That one first transgression, that sinful act of their first ancestor, παράπτωμα, resulted in the condemnation of all men, inasmuch as they were in Adam when he sinned. And now the sentence pronounced over Adam was, "Thou shalt die." And that death, again, was not the death of Adam only, but τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον,<sup>1)</sup> *because of that one sin of the one man, Adam, not Adam alone but the many died.* When? St. Paul does not say ἀποθνήσκουσιν; as of death as being in process at the present time or through all time, but again uses the aoristic past, ἀπέθανον. On that day when death came into the world by sin, Adam's sin, not Adam alone but the many who were in Adam when he sinned were engulfed in death, died as truly as and in the same sense in which they had sinned. This appears again when St. Paul says ἐν ἑνὶ παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσε διὰ τοῦ ἑνός, *by one offense death reigned through the one man Adam.*<sup>2)</sup> And in order to preclude the supposition that what he said concerning the consequences of Adam's sin should be understood as referring to the transgressions of divine commandments during their individual personal lives, St. Paul calls our attention to the fact that *death reigned even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.*<sup>3)</sup> That supposition is likewise excluded by the trend and scope of the entire argument, extending from Rom. 5, 12 to v. 21, in which he draws the parallel between Adam and Christ and between Adam's παράπτωμα and Christ's δικαίωμα. As Adam's disobedience, his offense, παράπτωμα, had been the act of one man, Adam, so Christ's obedience, his enactment of righteousness, δικαίωμα, was the perform-

1) Rom. 5, 15.

2) Rom. 5, 17.

3) Rom. 5, 14.



ance of one God-man, the second Adam. But Christ's obedience, though performed by him alone, had its significance, its blissful consequences, not for one, but for many, and in this it resembled the disobedience of the first Adam, which, though also an act of one, the first transgressor, had its significance, its deplorable consequences, not for him alone, but for the many. Nor does the parallelism end here. Christ's *δικαίωμα*, his work of obedience, is to bring righteousness upon the many, not inasmuch as they follow his example and perform the same works of righteousness as they walk in newness of life, but Christ's own fulfillment of the law is itself the righteousness of the many by imputation. And in this also Christ's *δικαίωμα* resembles Adam's *παράπτωμα*, which has resulted in condemnation and death to the many, not inasmuch as they walk in their father's footsteps, transgressing as he transgressed, *ἁμαρτάνοντες ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ*, sinning after the similitude of Adam's transgression. It is that one first act of disobedience, the first *παράβασις* and *παράπτωμα*, committed by Adam, which itself brought condemnation and death upon all men by imputation, Adam's sin and death being the sin and death of all his children, who were in him when and as he sinned.

Of course death is also the penalty of sin as inherent in and committed by the individual descendants of Adam, who was the first but not the last transgressor. Of Adam's children individually considered the Apostle says, "*There is no difference, for all HAVE SINNED and come short of the glory of God.*"<sup>1)</sup> And hence as concerning them all the Lord says, "*The soul that sinneth, it shall die,*"<sup>2)</sup> and "*The wages of sin is death.*"<sup>3)</sup> And thus we see that death is amply merited by all mankind and by each and every man, death in the true and full sense of the word, and that there can be but one way of averting death from a sinful world or a single human individual, and that is by full atonement

---

1) Rom. 3, 22. 23.

2) Ezek. 18, 4.

3) Rom. 6, 23.

for the sins of the world, Adam's sin and the sins of all his children. And since such atonement has actually been made, there is now a way of escaping death as the penalty of sin, and to those who have, hold and enjoy the benefits of the atonement made for them what is yet called death is no longer death in the true and full sense of the word, not a penalty, though still a consequence, of sin.

### CONSEQUENCES OF SIN.

The consequences of sin in man as distinguished from the penalty of sin differ from the latter inasmuch as they are of the nature of the first transgression, not brought upon man by the righteous will of God, but acquired by man by his own voluntary departure from his primeval holiness under the temptation of Satan. The first sinful act of man superinduced a sinful state of his entire nature. Fallen man was a changed being, thoroughly changed and deplorably changed. This appears with remarkable clearness from the Mosaic narrative. Immediately after the words: "*And he did eat,*"<sup>1)</sup> the record continues: "*And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked.*"<sup>2)</sup> The statement is not: "They knew that what they had done was wrong." This they knew when they committed the sinful act. But the first discovery they made after the first actual sin concerned not that act but themselves. Looking upon themselves, they discovered that they were naked, that they had now something to be ashamed of. In their primeval state of holiness their nakedness had been but an exhibition of their primeval purity, and hence *they were not ashamed.*<sup>3)</sup> Now their nakedness was an exposure of an unholy body, inhabited by an unholy, unclean soul. Thus, then, the image of God was lost, and man was now depraved in his understanding, his will, and his affections, in soul and body. In his primeval state man had been in con-

---

1) Gen. 3, 6.

2) Gen. 3, 7.

3) Gen. 2, 25.

formity with the holy will of God, according to which he loved God with all his heart and his neighbor with a true and holy love. All this was now changed. Man no longer loved God. Love is a desire for, and delight in, union and communion with its object. But when Adam and his wife heard the voice of the Lord in the garden, that voice no longer sounded sweet to them as a father's or mother's voice is sweet in the ears of a loving child. The nearness of God did not prompt them to draw nigh unto him, to seek his face and hold converse with him, but they hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God, avoiding communion with him, fleeing from him, for they loved him no more. *There is no fear in love*, says the Apostle,<sup>1)</sup> and St. Paul says, *Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear.*<sup>2)</sup> But when Adam made answer to the question: "*Where art thou?*" it was: "*I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid.*" There was no longer in Adam that spirit of filial love which cries "*Abba, Father,*"<sup>2)</sup> and Adam was no longer the free man under God, but a bondslave, crouching before his God in fear as of an enemy. Indeed, man was actually turned into an enemy of God, raising his accusing voice in blasphemy against his Maker and laying at his benefactor's feet at least part of the blame of his sin and charging his God with having brought upon him his ruin. For when he is asked, "*Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?*" his answer is, "*The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat,*"<sup>3)</sup> as if to say, "I might have abstained from eating of that tree, had it not been for that gift of thine, woman, to whom thou hast bound me for life and who has now wrought my ruin." At the same time these words of Adam reveal also a woful change of his relation to the person who was not only his neighbor but also his spouse. In his primeval state his first

---

1) 1 John 4, 18.

2) Rom. 8, 15.

3) Gen. 3, 11. 12.



words after Eve's creation had been an utterance of exulting joy and holy love, a promise of cleaving to the helpmeet with whom God had blessed him. Now after his fall his first words concerning her are words of accusation as of an enemy, and instead of taking the whole burden of his responsibility for his sin upon himself and lovingly pleading for his wife, he is all selfishness and endeavors to throw the burden of his guilt at least in part upon the woman by his side, though the result be her greater condemnation. The Apache Indian, who loads down his wife with a burden of peltry and provisions, while he, the lord of the wigwam, walks by her side unburdened, is pointed out as a picture of selfishness; and yet there is no essential difference between him and his first father immediately after the fall. Another immoral trait in fallen man appears in Adam's lack of openness and honesty and his manifest deceitfulness, going into hiding where he should face his God, and seeking subterfuges where he should have confessed. And all this in dealing with an omniscient God, who sees even the thoughts of man afar off. The very thought of deceiving him was foolishness in Adam and, in fact, a denial of God. Thus was man's understanding also darkened in consequence of sin. And as for his physical nature, that, too, was weakened and depraved. Man was no longer in his primeval vigor. Labor was thenceforth onerous toil in the sweat of his face under gnawing sorrow,<sup>1)</sup> and the germ of dissolution was already in his body,<sup>2)</sup> for whose protection God made him garments, not of leaves, only to protect his nakedness, but of the skins of animals, to protect him lest he should be prematurely exhausted by the influences of the elements, against which he was no longer proof.<sup>3)</sup> Thus was man sent forth from the garden of Eden, which was no longer for him an appropriate environment and dwelling place, and thrust out into a land of sorrow, bringing forth

---

1) Gen. 3, 17.

2) Gen. 3, 19.

3) Gen. 3, 21.

thorns and thistles, as for a fallen creature, though even then God had stretched forth his saving hand to lift him out of his misery, whence he could never have raised himself. For in all that we here learn concerning man in his fallen state as represented in Adam, there is not one redeeming feature, no vestige of that concreated holiness which was the glory of primeval man, nothing the development whereof might bring him nearer to his first estate. This does not say that man's depravity as it appears in Adam was not capable of variation or growth, that depraved as he was he could not have become more intensely depraved, that the darkness which encompassed him could not grow deeper and thicker, that his will had been unable to choose between one evil and another, that his affections were no longer human but had given place to the instincts of a brute. Adam was still man, a human, rational being with all the essential attributes and capabilities of human nature. He still possessed a certain knowledge of the law, and a conscience to remind him of the stringency of the law and his responsibility for his transgressions. But whatever he was, he was now in the bonds of sin, with not so much as a desire to free himself from such bonds. In all his conduct, his affections, his thoughts and words and acts, he exhibits himself as evil and only evil.

This state of total depravity did not, however, terminate where it originated, in our first ancestors. Of Adam we read that he *begat a son in his own likeness, after his image*.<sup>1)</sup> Of Adam's children and later descendants it is said, "*that which is born of the flesh is flesh*."<sup>2)</sup> Adam being totally depraved brought forth children also totally depraved. Not by a process of evolution extending through many generations was sin finally developed as from a microscopic germ, but Cain, the firstfruit of human propagation, was also the first murderer who, without real provocation,

---

1) Gen. 5, 3.

2) John 3, 6.

in sheer selfishness, violently took his brother's life,<sup>1)</sup> thus committing that crime which is even now registered among the most atrocious offences in the penal codes of the world, and under circumstances all of which would be considered aggravating and not one extenuating in any court of justice. Again, before that generation had passed away, there was another murderer among Adam's descendants, Lamech, the bigamist.<sup>2)</sup> Whence was that murderous spirit in Cain? It was not by following an evil example that he committed this evil deed, but that first murderous act was a fruit of an evil heart as described by Christ, saying, "*Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders,*" etc.<sup>3)</sup> And this description of the human heart was not only true in the days of Christ. The very first portraiture of the human heart laid down in holy Scripture is a picture of total depravity. Of the days when man began to multiply on the face of the earth,<sup>4)</sup> it is said: "*God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.*"<sup>5)</sup> There is in all the Scriptures no text which asserts more forcibly the total depravity of the heart of man. The terms employed are cumulative. The statement is not that man, or even all of the acts of man, were imperfect or evil. It does not say that the imaginations or thoughts of man were largely or preponderatingly evil, or evil at times and frequently; but it says that every imagination of the thoughts of man's heart was evil and only evil and continually evil. The babe in its mother's arm, men and women in the full vigor of manhood and womanhood, the aged stooping under the burden of years, all of them by day and by night, are here described as evil at heart, thoroughly and persistently evil.

This was before the flood, from which eight souls only were rescued, not because of an innate difference between

---

1) Gen. 4, 8.

2) Gen. 4, 23.

3) Matt. 15, 19.

4) Gen. 6, 1.

5) Gen. 6, 5.

them and those who perished. For such difference there was not. They were saved by faith through the goodness of God.<sup>1)</sup> And of Noah and his household according to the flesh, who gathered about an altar which Noah, the preacher of righteousness,<sup>2)</sup> had built unto the Lord, God said, "*The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth.*"<sup>3)</sup> And thus when in the dispersion of Babel the human race was scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth,<sup>4)</sup> it was a sinful race which sought new habitations and which has since then multiplied and replenished the earth, so that among all the nations and tribes of men not one has to this day been discovered which was not contaminated with sin from generation to generation. There was sin in the house of Abraham, sin in Egypt and in Canaan, sin throughout Jews and Gentiles, sin in our Lord's disciples as in the Pharisees and Sadducees, at Herod's court and Pilate's tribunal; sin is written on all the pages of history, sin wherever man has found a dwelling place. All this admits of but one explanation. It is this that innate, congenital sinfulness has taken the place of original concreated righteousness and holiness throughout all mankind. And this is the explanation we find in the Scriptures. "*That which is born of the flesh is flesh.*"<sup>5)</sup> "*We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags.*"<sup>6)</sup> For "*Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.*"<sup>7)</sup> "*Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me,*" says David.<sup>8)</sup> Not contaminated with sin by environment or steeped in sin in the course of years, but conceived in sin and coming into being in iniquity as he was shaped in his mother's womb, thus with congenital sinfulness permeating his body and soul was David and every other man ushered into existence.

---

1) Hebr. 11, 7.

4) Gen. 11, 4. 8.

7) Job 14, 4.

2) 2 Pet. 2, 5.

5) John 3, 6.

8) Ps. 51, 5.

3) Gen. 8, 21.

6) Is. 64, 6.



Thus is man by nature *carnal, sold under sin*,<sup>1)</sup> and in him, that is, *in his flesh, dwelleth no good thing*.<sup>2)</sup>

This innate sinfulness is also accounted as sin in the sight of God. Paul says of himself and of others like him, "*We are by nature the children of wrath, even as others*."<sup>3)</sup> Wrath is the assertion and exertion of divine holiness against sin, and we are by nature under the wrath of God. Ἡμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς are Paul's words, φύσει being in emphasis. Not only by what we have done, not by what we have become in the course of our lives, but as we were made and came into being in the course of nature, by our conception and birth, we are under wrath, the *wrath of God revealed from heaven against all ungodliness of man*.<sup>4)</sup>

This total depravity of our corrupt nature extends to all our faculties. Our desires and affections are turned into inordinate affections and evil concupiscence,<sup>5)</sup> lusts of uncleanness, walking after which is walking after the flesh,<sup>6)</sup> and desires of the flesh,<sup>7)</sup> deceitful lusts, according to which our old man is corrupt.<sup>8)</sup> Our will is perverted and opposed to the will of God and only prone to evil, the carnal mind being enmity against God, not subject to the law of God and unable to be.<sup>9)</sup> Our understanding is darkened, totally blind in spiritual things,<sup>10)</sup> so that the *natural man conceiveth not the things of the spirit of God*: for they are *foolishness* unto him; *neither CAN he know them*.<sup>11)</sup> This deterioration is particularly and painfully evident in the derangement of human conscience after the fall and under the influence of sin. For while no man is entirely destitute of conscience, the faculty of rating the ethical acts of man according to

1) Rom. 7, 14.

2) Rom. 7, 18.

3) Eph. 2, 3.

4) Ps. 5, 5. Rom. 1, 18.

5) Col. 3, 5.

6) 2 Pet. 2, 10.

7) Eph. 2, 3.

8) Eph. 4, 22.

9) Rom. 8, 7.

10) Eph. 4, 18: "Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart."

11) 1 Cor. 2, 14.

the moral norm congenital in man is no more that reliable witness bearing testimony to the stringency of the law and man's responsibility for every deviation therefrom, but largely fails to perform its primary and secondary functions. Thus the torpid, sleeping, callous, weak, or erring conscience, neglecting to act and react according to the true norm, or performing its various functions according to false norms, might alone suffice to exhibit human nature in its fallen state as a lamentable ruin of its former self. Thus all our faculties are enslaved under the power of sin, without any ability in any measure to work our own spiritual restoration. "*I am carnal, sold under sin,*" says Paul.<sup>1)</sup> That which determines our actions is sin, as Paul says, "*I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind and bringing me into captivity of the law of sin which is in my members.*"<sup>2)</sup> Sin is a power which governs us, making us the servants of sin,<sup>3)</sup> and thus are we *all* gone aside and *altogether* accounted filthy.<sup>4)</sup>

Such is the natural *state* of fallen man under sin. But this is not all, though it is fully and abundantly sufficient to merit death and everlasting damnation under the righteous wrath of God, which is revealed against *all* ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.<sup>5)</sup> The evil tree also bears evil fruit, the contaminated fountain issues forth contaminated waters, the natural depravity of man is productive of manifold actual sins. Man is not only evil but also does evil. *There is none that DOETH good, not one.*<sup>6)</sup> Man by evil acts fulfills the desires of the flesh.<sup>7)</sup> Being by nature darkness he performs unfruitful works of darkness,<sup>8)</sup> and being flesh

---

1) Rom. 7, 14.

2) Rom. 7, 23.

3) Rom. 6, 17: "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered to you." Rom. 6, 20: "For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness."

4) Ps. 14, 3.

5) Rom. 1, 18.

6) Rom. 3, 12. Ps. 14, 3.

7) Eph. 2, 3.

8) Eph. 5, 11.

he exerts himself in works of the flesh;<sup>1)</sup> his heart being desperately wicked<sup>2)</sup> he brings forth wicked works;<sup>3)</sup> being corrupt he does abominable works.<sup>4)</sup> Sin dwelling and rooted in our hearts works in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.<sup>5)</sup>

Actual sins may be variously classified. Thus there are sins of commission<sup>6)</sup> of that which God forbids, and sins of omission<sup>7)</sup> of that which God demands, internal,<sup>8)</sup> external,<sup>9)</sup> voluntary<sup>10)</sup> and involuntary<sup>11)</sup> sins, sins committed directly against God<sup>12)</sup> and sins committed indirectly against God,<sup>13)</sup> and directly against the sinner's self,<sup>14)</sup> or against his neighbor,<sup>15)</sup> sins committed by ourselves<sup>16)</sup> and sins of others in which we participate.<sup>17)</sup>

A. G.

---

1) Gal. 5, 19. Col. 5, 19.

2) Jer. 17, 9.

3) Col. 1, 21.

4) Ps. 14, 1.

5) Rom. 7, 5.

6) Gal. 5, 19—21. Rom. 1, 23; Rom. 3, 13—15.

7) James 4, 17. Rom. 1, 21. Dan. 9, 13.

8) Matt. 5, 28. 1 John 3, 15.

9) Matt. 12, 34. Gal. 5, 19—21.

10) Rom. 1, 32. Is. 3, 9.

11) Numb. 15, 22. 24. Luke 12, 48.

12) Ps. 41, 1. Rom. 1, 21—23. Prov. 8, 36. Exod. 20, 3. 7.

13) Gen. 39, 9. Acts 5, 2. 3.

14) 1 Cor. 6, 18. Eph. 5, 19.

15) Exod. 20, 12—16.

16) 2 Sam. 12, 7. Gen. 3, 12. 13.

17) 1 Tim. 5, 22. Eph. 5, 7; 5, 11. Rev. 18, 4.

*(To be continued.)*

## Exegetical Theology.

---

### THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM

WITH A

### PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

(Continued.)

---

#### THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT.

Gen. 9, 6: *“Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man.”*

The fifth commandment is a sacred enclosure drawn about human life for its protection and defense. In the words preceding our text God says, “Surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man’s brother will I require the life of man.” Here God threatens to visit his vindictive justice upon all who shall violate the sacredness of human life. In our text he makes provision for the execution of this threat by ordaining that the murderer’s temporal punishment shall be a violent death inflicted by human hands. To impose capital punishment on the murderer is thus seen to be so far from being contrary to the will of God that it is rather expressly demanded by the positive law here enacted by the supreme Lawgiver and Judge himself, and the refusal to mete out justice according to this ordinance is disobedience to the will of God. Even Cain’s conscience told him that by slaying his brother he had forfeited his life, Gen. 4, 14, and it was by a special provision of God and by a mark set on him that the first murderer’s life was shielded from the avenging hand of man, Gen. 4, 15. By this special dispensation God, who is the lord of human life as of all other created things, would not,



however, establish a rule for all times. The rule is established in our text, which states also a reason for this rule; *for in the image of God made he man*. Human life is not of the same kind with the life of brutes. Man does not differ from brutes as brutes differ among themselves, but is a being of a higher order, distinct from all brutes, the only visible creature originally made in the image of God. And while it is not contrary to the will of God that man should kill fowl, fishes or beasts of the forest and domestic animals for food, Gen. 9, 2, 3, the human life shall be held sacred, and the shedding of human blood shall be avenged by man. By whom among men, the subsequent texts will specify.

Matt. 26, 52: "*All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.*"

Peter, the apostle of Christ, had drawn the sword in resentment of an act of violence committed against his Master. But Jesus, far from approving of Peter's intervention, has only words of rebuke for his disciple, not only because it was the will of God that Jesus should be led captive, to suffer and die, and Peter's interference was, for this reason, out of time and place; but because in using the sword Peter had arrogated to himself what was not his proper right and duty. Peter had *taken* the sword. It was not given him by authority. He was not a minister of God with power of the sword to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil, Rom. 13, 4, but a minister of the word with power to forgive and retain sins. Matt. 16, 19. And hence, instead of administering justice and punishing a crime, he was violating justice and committing a crime, exposing himself to punishment. Thus to-day, to avenge wrong without proper authority, as, f. ex., to lynch a criminal, is *taking* the sword and deserving to perish with the sword, not only a crime against human law, but a sin against the divine commandment, "*Thou shalt not kill.*" On the other hand, this text also shows that it is not incumbent upon a Chris-

tian to deliver up for punishment a fellow Christian, who has, by offending the secular law, become liable to punishment, though it is a brother's duty to admonish the offending brother and lead him to repentance, as Christ admonished Peter but did not turn him over to the secular arm that he might perish with the sword. To punish crime is under God the province of civil government, as to remit or retain sins is under God a right and duty of the church.

Rom. 13, 4: "*He beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.*"

The subject is ἡ ἐξουσία, the civil power, of whom it is said θεοῦ γὰρ διδκονός ἐστι σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, *he is the minister of God to thee for good*. The noun θεοῦ is here in emphasis, which is not reproduced in the English version. It is from *God*, not originally or primarily from the people, that civil governments derive their authority and power, and God has made them what they officially are. In such office the civil ruler is a minister of God, of whom the apostle here says, οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ, *for not in vain doth he bear the sword*. Γὰρ here refers to the preceding context: "*But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid.*" Fear, φόβος, is the expectation of future or impending loss or pain. The right to inflict loss or pain, even the loss of life and pain of death, upon the malefactor rests with the civil government, the minister of God. God alone primarily is the lord of life and death. But he has appointed his minister, the civil power, and has given him τὴν μάχαιραν, not simply *a sword* but *the sword* of his office. And this instrument of death the minister of God is not to take but to *carry*,<sup>1)</sup> and not εἰκὴ, *not in vain*, but to use it for what it is made and given him. He is not to use it indiscriminately or arbitrarily, for private revenge or

---

1) φορεῖν *verbum est continuativum*, φέρειν *inceptivum*. Hermann ad Soph. El. v. 715.

other unlawful purposes. He is not to put to the sword such as have not done evil to merit the sword. All this would not be use but abuse of the sword, and worse than carrying it in vain. But he is to use it as *a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil*. The punishment of crime is not a reformatory measure, but a vindication of the majesty of the law. Hence capital punishment is not incompatible with the true end and aim of punishment, but most appropriate where the severest penalty which can be inflicted by man is called for. Nor is it an unjust usurpation of divine authority, but the execution of justice under divine authority when inflicted on the criminal by civil government as the minister of God.

Rom. 12, 19: "*Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.*"

Vengeance, retribution for evil, is properly an execution of divine justice: for it is written, Deut. 32, 35: לִי נִקְמָה וְשָׁלוֹם, or as our text gives it, ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω. The pronouns ἐμοί and ἐγὼ are in emphasis, to indicate the more forcibly that he who takes vengeance in his own hand usurps that which is not his but God's. Hence we should, when we are offended or injured by our fellowmen, beware of avenging ourselves, but rather give place unto wrath. The Greek text has τῇ ὀργῇ, THE wrath. What wrath is meant appears from the subsequent context, the quotation from Deut. 32, which is annexed by γάρ. The wrath of God is the assertion and exertion of his holiness in opposition to sin. To this we should *give place*, allow it to have its way in carrying out its designs.<sup>1)</sup> And the ways of God to work retribution are manifold, direct and indirect. He may punish through his minister, who carries the sword as a revenger

1) Cf. Μήτε δίδετε τόπον τῷ διαβόλῳ, Eph. 4, 27, do not give the devil opportunity to carry out his designs. Sir. 38, 12: ἱατρῷ δὸς τόπον, let the physician have his way.

to execute wrath, Rom. 13, 4. He may inflict punishment in a thousand other ways and *will repay* according as he will dispose. But he will also bring retribution on those who violate his majesty by avenging themselves, hurting or harming their neighbor for harm he may have inflicted upon them.

Matt. 5, 21. 22: "*Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hellfire.*"

This text, as the entire Sermon on the Mount, has often been grossly misconstrued, especially by such as would make a new lawgiver of Christ and find in this discourse a supplement to the law, and not what it truly is, an exposition and application of the law. In the words, *Ye have heard that it was said by, or better to, them of old time*, he refers to the reading and expounding of the Mosaic law in the synagogues, where the teachers of the people in those days were chiefly of the Pharisees. We know what the doctrine and life of the Pharisees was. Their righteousness was an outward observance of what they considered the precepts of the law; they considered only the gross violations of those precepts sinful in the meaning of the law and deserving of punishment. In this sense they would expound the old commandment, *Thou shalt not kill*, taking the word, *kill*, to mean the violent destruction of human life, and declaring him, and him only, who had committed such crime as liable to trial, sentence and punishment in the proper tribunals, the courts of the place, which according to Deut. 16, 18 were to "*judge the people with just judgment.*" Such was the exposition of the fifth commandment as given by the Phari-



sees and heard in the synagogues. In opposition to this inadequate exhibition and inculcation of the law, and not as going beyond the law itself, Christ says, "*But I say unto you,*" not what you hear from the Pharisees but what I am about to tell you is the true meaning of that old commandment, Thou shalt not kill. Sin is committed and judgment is merited and incurred not only by violently taking another's life, not only by the outward act, but even by the affections of the heart, anger rising within the soul against a brother. Such inward sin is as truly an offense against the commandment, Thou shalt not kill, as the outward act would be, and as truly deserving of punishment in the sight of God. Thus also bitter words employed against a brother, such as *raca*, Aramaic רִיקָא, *empty, vain*, and מוֹרָא, *fool*, are really and truly sins against that old commandment, bringing upon the offender the danger of council and of hellfire, which is, in fact, the punishment merited by all who transgress a law of God. The various efforts to establish a climax from "whosoever is angry" to "whosoever shall say, Thou fool," as from a lesser to a greater and still greater offense, are hardly to the point, since in that case bitterness and anger directed against a brother would appear to make the sinner liable to judgment in an inferior court, but not to hellfire, which it certainly does. What Christ would say is, that every evil thought or affection or word or deed consisting in, or flowing from, hatred against a fellowman is really and truly sin, worthy of punishment, even to eternal damnation.

1 John 3, 15: "*Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.*"

In the preceding context the apostle had referred to Cain, who slew his brother because his own works were evil and his brother's righteous, and to the world, which, being evil, hates the children of God, vv. 12 and 13. In the

14. verse he contrasts those who have passed from death into life, which appears from their love of the brethren, and him that abideth in death, since he loveth not his brother, and now he closes the argument, saying, Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer. The word here employed is not *φονεὺς*, murderer, but *ἀνθρωποκτόνος*, literally *manslayer*, the more graphic term of the two. Cain, who slew his brother, is evidently still in the apostle's mind, and what he would lead us to understand is that the commandment against which Cain sinned is not only transgressed by the actual violent destruction of human life, but also by hatred conceived or entertained in the heart. And hence as the murderer in deed has according to the law forfeited his own life, so the murderer in heart excludes himself from eternal life. And this is a truth which the apostle considers familiar to every Christian. Yet he does not deem it superfluous to remind them of what they already know. And thus to-day we are ever in need of being reminded of the true meaning of the law, also of the fifth commandment, lest, being unmindful of its import, we permit hatred and enmity to take root in our hearts and endanger the salvation of our souls, and in order that by the law properly understood there may be in us the knowledge of sin.

Matt. 15, 19: "*Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.*"

The first man who was born on earth was a murderer, shedding his own brother's blood. Being the first murderer among men he was certainly not misled to the perpetration of his crime by evil example. Neither was he persuaded by any man's words, prompting him to slay his brother. How, then, came he to be a murderer? We have the answer in these words of Christ: "*Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, MURDERS,*" etc. Cain's heart was evil, his

nature was wholly depraved, flesh born of the flesh. And from that evil heart proceeded evil thoughts, murderous thoughts, and finally atrocious murder itself. Thus there is a murderous root in every man's heart, which may at any time sprout forth, and when it bears its natural fruit that fruit is a murderous deed. In fact, every emotion of anger or hatred would naturally result in bloodshed, were it not held down by circumstances and conflicting interests under the providence of God. This is also indicated by the plural, *φόνου*, murders, employed in the text, which stands for various acts of the same kind as proceeding from one and the same heart. And though human justice may take cognizance only of the outward act, murder in the heart is just as truly sin before God, and the wages of sin is death.

Is. 58, 7: *"Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?"*

This text is taken from a longer passage in which God censures his people for priding themselves on their righteousness in works of their own choice, while they had neglected to do works according to the will and commandment of God. Having especially repudiated their fasts and other measures of self-imposed penitence, the Lord continues, "Is not this the fast that I have chosen?" etc., v. 6, and to the commendable works mentioned in the verse preceding our text he adds others, saying: "Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry," etc. All these are works according to the fifth commandment, which enjoins upon us the duty of helping and befriending our neighbor in every bodily need. We should not look upon bread as being given us only to appease our own hunger, nor upon our house as only to shelter ourselves, nor upon the raiment we possess as intended to cover our own bodies only, but

on the contrary, that others beside us are hungry, and that there are poor without shelter and without clothing, should be so many opportunities for us to do unto them as we would that others should do to us. It is worthy of note that the needy here recommended to our care are not described as the deserving poor or those who suffer innocently, but the motive given in our text for these works of charity is that the poor and needy are of our own flesh, human as we are. To point out the need of our fellowmen as being brought upon them by their own neglect and lack of foresight or economy is very often merely a pretext, behind which a heart void of mercy, and hands unwilling to part with what they hold, endeavor to hide themselves; thus, also, certain so-called benevolent societies, which are, in fact, based upon and determined by selfishness, are but hiding places and disguises for unwillingness to exercise true charity in works as those enjoined in this text.

Rom. 12, 20: "*Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.*"

In the preceding verse the apostle has enjoined upon his readers to avenge not themselves, but rather to give place to the wrath of God who says, *Vengeance is mine, I will repay*. And now he continues, *Therefore*, since God has reserved wrath unto himself, love only remains for us, love also toward the enemy, and hence, *if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink*. Not to take but to preserve life, even the life of an enemy, behooves those who would live in obedience to the will of God. Hunger and thirst, as every other bodily need in a fellowman, should be an occasion for us to help and befriend him, not because we expect to be again befriended by him, or because we have experienced the same at his hands, but even though he be an enemy who has done us harm and may do us harm again. Yet, while punishment is not



properly a reformatory measure, kindness bestowed upon an enemy may be, inasmuch as it may lead him more forcibly than revenge might have done to understand his wickedness and the wrong he has inflicted upon his benefactor. This conviction may be like coals of fire on his head, a painful consciousness of his evil deeds as they appear in sharp contrast with the acts of benevolence experienced in return at the hands of him whom he has wronged.

Matt. 5, 5. 7. 9: "*Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.*"

The law, as has been shown, is transgressed not only by the outward act of shedding blood, but also by the sinful disposition of the heart, by unkind affections, anger and hatred, and by bitter words. Thus on the other hand conformity with the law may consist not only in the performance of outward acts of kindness, as feeding the hungry and clothing the naked, but also in a friendly disposition and kind affections, thoughts, and words, toward others. Three virtues pertaining to the fifth commandment are commended in these verses from the Sermon on the Mount. The first is meekness. *Πραῖς, the meek*, are those in whom cheerful kindness and mildness shuts out bitterness and selfish resentment. *Ἐλεήμονες, the merciful*, are those who have compassion with another's misery. *Εἰρηνοποιοί, the peacemakers*, are those who, being opposed to sinful strife, not only as between themselves and others but also among their fellowmen, are bent upon establishing peace and good will wherever their influence goes. And as the penalty of sin is merited not only by the gross violation of the law but also by sins of the heart and in thoughts and words (see above, Matt. 5, 21. 22. 1 John 3, 15), so the divine promises of grace and every blessing to all that keep his commandments apply not only to outward acts of obedience but also to con-

formity with the will of God in thoughts and words. Thus here blessings are pronounced over the meek, the merciful and the peacemakers. But again it should be noted that while punishment is merited by the sinner and the *wages* of sin is death, the blessings bestowed upon them who keep the commandments are free gifts of divine goodness. This appears very clearly from the promises of this text. The meek shall *inherit* the earth, not obtain it as their merited remuneration. The time shall come when the meek shall hear the greeting, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world, Matt. 25, 34, according to the prophecy of Isaiah, They shall inherit the land forever, Is. 16, 21, when God shall create new heavens and a new earth, Is. 65, 17; 66, 22. 2 Pet. 3, 13. Rev. 21, 1. Again the merciful will obtain *mercy*, they shall experience the goodness of God in their own afflictions, temporal and spiritual. And the peacemakers shall be called the children of God. Things are known by their names and should be named what they are known to be. Thus the peacemakers by their endeavors to allay strife and establish peace shall appear and be known and acknowledged as children of God, bearing the likeness of their Father, who is the God of peace. And thus again this virtue is not here described as meritorious but as blessed by the goodness of God, whose children we are for Christ's sake, by faith.

Matt. 5, 25: "*Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison.*"

The imagery which underlies this text is taken from the relation of a debtor and his creditor, who in default of payment might take the debtor into court and have him sentenced and condemned to imprisonment for debt. This appears more clearly from the subsequent context, which

speaks of payment to the uttermost farthing, v. 26. The adversary, then, with whom we should make haste to be reconciled, is not in this case, as some have assumed, one who has offended us—for that would make us the creditor—but one who has been offended by us and who therefore has an account against us which we are bound to satisfy. Thus the case is not the reverse of that described in verse 23, but the same, and the admonition is simply continued, inculcating the duty of being reconciled to those whom we have offended, to seek forgiveness of those whom we have wronged; and the special admonition here added is not to defer but to be prompt in our settlement with our adversary. For procrastination is also in such matters a very dangerous thing and may lodge him who refuses to be reconciled in the prison house of hell, where the last farthing shall never be paid. And here it should be noted that the sin against which this warning goes is not the original offence whereby the neighbor has been wronged, but the unwillingness to be reconciled, which is here pictured as a damnable sin.

### SIXTH COMMANDMENT.

Eph. 5, 3. 4: *“But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becomes saints; neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks.”*

The conjunction *but* refers to the previous context, *“Be ye therefore followers of God, as dear children; and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savor.”* vv. 1 and 2. As altogether incompatible with the imitation of God and Christ in holy love the apostle mentions the things named or intimated in our text. *Πορνεία* is a gross form of what is named with the general term of *πᾶσα ἀκαθαρσία*. All sin is uncleanness.

Thus the Psalmist prays, *Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity and cleanse me from my sin;*<sup>1)</sup> and again, *Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.*<sup>2)</sup> And Christ speaks of sin which dwells in and proceeds from the heart as that which defiles a man.<sup>3)</sup> But there is one class of sins which are of such a nature that, as the apostle indicates in our text, the mere naming of them is embarrassing to Christians; for we are *saints*, and holiness is purity, which would not even get near that which defiles. These sins are in a peculiar sense sins of uncleanness, the sins of unchastity, the sins forbidden in the sixth commandment. It is this class of sins which more than any other underlie the sense of shame, and the suggestion or consciousness of which drives or ought to drive the blush of shame to cheeks which, on the other hand, would be blanched by the pallor of fear caused by sins of a different type. Hence also the term of *αἰσχρότης*, for which the English Bible has *filthiness*, but which is more exactly rendered by *shameful conduct*. It is this peculiar nature of these sins which causes them to be chiefly committed in secret. Where they are openly committed it is because the sense of shame is, in the individual or in a community, blunted in such a degree as to react no longer as it should against these works of the flesh. Thus the modern theatre, the dance of to-day, and many society games, are abominations to which no decent person should in any way become a party and which could not serve as amusements for decent people but for a prevailing obtuseness of the sense of shame. The terms *μωρολογία* and *εὐτραπεία* are connected by *ἤ*, *or*, which after the *καί* preceding both indicates that the two terms are descriptive of the same thing under different aspects. *Μωρολογία* is foolish frivolity in words, *εὐτραπεία* is vain frivolity in demeanor, *leichtfertiges Geschwätz und Gebahren*, things which are *μὴ ἀνήκοντα*, *improper* for

1) Ps. 51, 2.

2) Ps. 51, 7.

3) Matt. 15, 18—20.



an earnest Christian, and of which one who would walk in Christ's footsteps should be ashamed. Of such improprieties a certain class of jokes and anecdotes and the immodest laughter they elicit, as well as certain immodesties in dress and deportment, may be especially mentioned. Such manner of merriment is unbecoming to a Christian, who should manifest the gladness of his heart in other ways, one of which is named here by the apostle, the *giving of thanks*.

Eph. 5, 12: "*For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret.*"

In the previous context we are admonished to *have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather to reprove them*, v. 11. The apostle has described the works of the heathen world of his day as works of darkness, thereby indicating that they are largely performed as secret sins, which even more than certain other sins shun the light of day and the eyes of witnesses not occupied with the same sins. Of this description are the sins of unchastity, and among them, again, certain sins of uncleanness before others. These secret sins were extensively practiced in the time of St. Paul and are widely practiced in our day, sins against nature so repulsive that the apostle only points toward them as from a distance and forbears to mention them more definitely, stating his reason in our text. He would not defile his mouth or the ears of his hearers by even speaking of them more particularly in an epistle intended for all classes of readers. This is a very emphatic way of impressing his readers with the shameful and repulsiveness of the sins here intimated, and with the abhorrence wherewith those should be viewed who not only speak of but practice such abominations.

Matt. 19, 6: "*What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.*"

The first married couple, Adam and Eve, were in a peculiar sense joined together in wedlock by God himself;

as we read in Gen. 2, 22. In a different sense, however, all those who entered into valid marriage have been joined together by God. For matrimony is of divine institution, and as such it is what God has made it, a union of a man and a woman for life. Thus married people are not bound together merely by a contract entered into by themselves as by their mutual consent, so that they might again by mutual consent revoke their agreement and dissolve their bond of marriage; but being united in a divine ordinance, the bond which unites them is of God's own making and must not be dissolved but by God alone or under the conditions determined by his will. This is true also where the state of marriage has been entered with some violation of the law of God in points not essential to valid marriage; for in such cases the sin or sins committed were not according to the will of God and least of all caused by God and should be duly repented of by those who sinned; but that the marriage bond thus assumed should be indissoluble is according to the will of God, and hence those whom God has joined together no man shall put asunder.

Matt. 19, 9: "*Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.*"

In these words Christ deals with those who, like the Pharisees of his day, looked upon marriage as being dissoluble by mutual consent or by the observation of a certain provision made by Moses for those who, in the hardness of their hearts, insisted upon severing before men the marriage bond by which they were bound before God. Such separations were looked upon as being legitimate dissolutions of marriage, whereby both parties were free to remarry with whom they might choose, provided that the proper form of divorcement had been observed, whatever the cause of such divorcement might have been, vv. 7 and 8. There is but one cause which justifies divorce before God, and that is

fornication, whereby the innocent party is entitled to consider the bond of marriage dissolved, though he or she may also condone the offence and continue the union with the offending party. But for no other cause may a man put away his wife without offending against the word that what God has joined together no man should put asunder; and if, having put away his wife without sufficient cause, he should marry another, he would thereby commit adultery in becoming one flesh with a person not his wife?

2 Pet. 2, 14: "*Having eyes full of adultery, and that can not cease from sin.*"

In the chapter from which this text is taken the apostle describes certain impious deceivers of the latter days, who by doctrine and practice mislead many into their evil ways. The apostle's prediction has been fulfilled in every point chiefly in popery and the various institutions peculiar to the synagogue of antichrist. One of the abominations which have rendered the Roman see and many other purported seats of exquisite holiness repulsive even in the eyes of Romanists themselves is that of all varieties of carnal licentiousness. Our text mentions one form of voluptuousness in describing those men as *having eyes full of adultery*. A more precise translation of the original would be *having eyes full of an adulteress*, that is, looking with intense pleasure upon an unchaste woman as a hungry man looks with gloating eyes upon an article of food, or as one who is parched with thirst looks at a cup of water as if he would drink it with his eyes. Thus unchastity has driven out modesty so that, instead of looking down abashed or turning away his eyes when immodest persons or things intrude themselves upon his gaze, a man will rather indulge in his evil lusts and derive pleasure from intently gazing upon what may inflame his licentious desires. This is the sin of those who seek and find enjoyment in witnessing unchaste performances on the theatrical stage, immodest paintings

and statuary and other objects which must offend a modest eye and heart. Of course, if such abuse of the eyes is sinful it is no less sinful to provide for voluptuous eyes the objects whereon they would feast, to pander to licentiousness by immodest exposure, by the production or exhibition of immodest pictures or statues under the pretext or with the boast of dramatic or plastic or pictorial art.

Matt. 5, 27. 28: "*Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath already committed adultery with her in his heart.*"

Here again Christ rebukes the conception and exposition of the law as it was prevalent among the Pharisees of his day, who looked upon the omission of gross offences against the law or the performance of outward works demanded by the law as adequate fulfillment of the divine commandments. What he inculcates is that not only the consummation of the sin of adultery is a transgression of the sixth commandment, but that the unclean desire of the heart directed upon a woman is before God adultery committed with that woman. Adultery, as every other work of the flesh, originates in the heart, and every unclean desire would terminate in a gross work of the flesh if it were not prevented by circumstances under the control of divine government. Besides, God demands not only outward but also inward conformity with his holy will, and as in his omniscience he sees the thoughts of men and their desires and affections afar off, he is thereby offended just as truly and consistently as by the outward acts which are performed in the sight of men. This should be all the more assiduously inculcated and remembered as concerning the sins of unchastity, since these sins are more extensively practiced and indulged in by evil thoughts and imaginations than many sins against other commandments of God.



Hebr. 13, 4: "*Whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.*"

All the words of this statement are in the original by their arrangement placed in emphasis: Πόρνους δὲ καὶ μοιχοὺς κρίνει ὁ θεός, while the regular order would be ὁ θεός κρίνει πορνούς καὶ μοιχοὺς. The secular courts deal much more largely with open transgressors of the laws against the security of person and property corresponding to the fifth and seventh commandments, while fornication and adultery, being naturally practiced in secret and under cover of darkness more generally than other sins, are in comparison less frequently prosecuted and punished by the secular arm. But be they ever so carefully guarded and so secretly performed, these sins will not go unpunished. God sees and records them all and will judge those against whom they stand recorded in his book. And for still another reason God threatens to punish these sins of unchastity. They are very often made light of among men. Profligate seducers and defilers of women, and women who by voluptuous arts entice men from the path of virtue, even pride themselves with their so-called victories and conquests and are looked upon by others as heroes and heroines in their way, by whose example others are incited to like practices. But God puts a different estimate upon these things. He will judge them not according to the perverse codes of corrupt society, but according to the norm of his holy law. Hence the emphasis on κρίνει. God will not condone and make light of sins as these; much less will he justify and even extol them; but he will *judge* them and bring condemnation upon those also who escape temporal punishment.

Rom. 13, 13: "*Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying.*"

Κῶμοι, which the English Bible renders *rioting*, is the word for *banquets*, which, among the heathen of those days, were generally occasions for immoderate eating, the

guests being gorged with food and entertained with music, song, and dances. King Herod celebrated his birthday with a *ᾠμος*, Mark 14, 6 ff. On other occasions indulgence in excessive drinking, even to intoxication, was more prominent, and to this the apostle refers by *μέθαι*, *drunken revelries*. These sins are in very extensive practice to-day in club houses and saloons, at weddings and anniversaries and other occasions, and are as little befitting a Christian to-day as they were in the apostle's day. They are in themselves gross works of the flesh and often lead to other works of the flesh. Of such also the apostle speaks as he continues, *μὴ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις*, *not in illicit carnal intercourse and lewd excesses*. These sins are often the outcome of those named before, and they, too, have their occasions and localities. Many a man and woman would not have fallen into these gross abominations if they had kept away from places and occasions where no Christian should be found. That even Christians are in danger of gross sins of unchastity appears from the divine admonition laid down in this text for Christians, who are here, on the other hand, called upon to walk *ἐνσχymόνως*, *decently, as in the day*. Sins of uncleanness are preeminently works of darkness, shunning the light of day; but a Christian should so conduct himself in all things that he may have no cause of fleeing the light. A Christian should "lead a chaste and decent life in word and deed." This should be his *walk*, as with a steady step, moving forward in the way of the commandments of God, Ps. 119, 32, and with God's word as a lamp unto his feet, Ps. 119, 105, he walks through an evil world to his eternal home. Thus will he avoid the ways of sin.

Eph. 4, 29: "*Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers.*"

Πᾶς λόγος σαπρὸς ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὁμῶν μὴ ἐκπορευέσθω. Σαπρὸς, from the root *σαπ*, from which we have the words

σῆπω, *to rot, or make rotten*, σῆψις, *rottenness*, means *rotten, foul, nasty*. Every child knows or feels what is meant by *nasty words*. These should not come out of a Christian's mouth, not any of them. How unbecoming to a Christian such words are is all the more clear from the contrast in which they stand to such words as befit a Christian. St. James shows how improper cursing is to a Christian by saying: *Out of the same mouth proceed blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be.* James 3, 10. Thus St. Paul here leads us to comprehend that indecent words are ill agreed with Christian decency in words. A Christian should speak that which is ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χροείας. The genitive, τῆς χροείας, is gen. relationis, and the whole phrase is, *That which is good, useful, for edification as the occasion may require*, ἵνα δὲ χάρις τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, *that he may render a welcome service to those who hear him*. All this is the very reverse of indecent words, which can not edify but only demoralize. Hence, the more a Christian endeavors to make the right use of his mouth according to the apostle's direction, the less will he be in danger of abusing and defiling it by unsavory speech, lewd songs, unclean anecdotes and puns, and the like. In the subsequent context the apostle gives two more reasons for abstaining from filthy words; they grieve the Holy Spirit and are altogether unworthy of the future state of glory and perfect holiness for which we are already sealed, v. 30.

1 Cor. 6, 19: "*Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?*"

In the previous context, v. 18, the apostle had said, "*He that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body,*" and had given this as a reason for his admonition, "*Flee from fornication.*" And to render the weight of this argument all the more clear to his readers, and especially to such as might not at once grasp the significance of the

nature of these sins of unchastity, he proceeds to point out two reasons why a Christian should not defile his body. In the first place he reminds the Christian that his body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in him and which he has of God. To defile a temple was even among the heathen nations looked upon as a heinous sin, a sacrilegious crime, and that while the temples dedicated to the worship of pagan idols were the very reverse of dwellings of God, but, like the heathen sacrifices, devoted to devils, 1 Cor. 10, 20. But a Christian's body is truly a temple of God wherein the Holy Spirit dwells, sanctifying his abode by his divine presence. In view of this it must appear a most awful sacrilege to defile the body of a Christian man or woman, especially when that sin is committed by the Christian himself, who has within him the testimony of the Holy Spirit whereby He makes known His presence in various ways, as the Spirit of power, of hope, and of sanctification. —The second reason why a Christian should beware of polluting his body with the filth of carnal sin is stated in the words, "*And ye are not your own,*" which are further explained in the next verse, where the apostle continues, "*For ye are bought with a price.*" We have the same words again 1 Cor. 7, 23, and St. Peter is more explicit, saying, "*Ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without a blemish and without spot.*" 1 Pet. 1, 18, 19. The same apostle also speaks of those who "*deny the Lord who bought them.*" 2 Pet. 2, 1. And in Rev. 5, 9 the saints say in their new song, "*Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.*" Thus are we bought with a price, not only our souls but also our bodies. Thus are we not ours but Christ's, who has purchased us to himself with his holy, precious blood and with his innocent suffering and death, that we should be his own, body and soul. And hence we should



beware of defiling that body which is Christ's by rightful acquisition, and instead of polluting it we should rather "*glorify God in our body and in our spirit, which are God's,*" v. 20.

Ps. 51, 10: "*Create in me a clean heart, o God; and renew a right spirit within me.*"

That all manner of sin springs from man's evil heart has already appeared in the text quoted under the fifth commandment, Matt. 15, 19: "*Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications,*" etc. Hence a thorough reform whereby we may be cured from this leprosy also of unchastity must consist in a renewal of our hearts. But this is not within our power but a work of God. David had by sad experience learned that from his evil heart even the grossest sins, adultery and murder, might spring; and though he was truly penitent of what he had done, he knew that he was not secure from the recurrence of such atrocious sins while his heart was evil and unclean. Hence the psalmist's petition, "*Create in me a clean heart, o God.*"

Prov. 23, 31—33: "*Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder. Thine eyes shall behold strange women, and thine heart shall utter perverse things.*"

This is a warning to those who are in danger of being enticed to excessive drink and its consequences. The *color of the wine* and its *sparkling and glittering in the cup* are apt to entice the man whose eyes are not guarded, and when the cup has gone to the lips the taste of the wine may add to the charm under which many have succumbed. The words rendered, *When it moveth itself aright*, in the English Bible, are in the Hebrew יִהְיֶה בְּיִשְׁרָיו. The word, *when*, has no equivalent in the text, and Luther's version, "*Er gehet glatt ein,*" is an exquisite idiomatic expression for the more literal: *He walks complacently on level ways.*

The wine is here compared with a portly man who walks down the drinker's throat. But the wine, when taken in excess, will change its character and *bite like a serpent and sting like an adder*. What these words say in figurative speech, the following words state in proper terms: "*Thine eyes shall behold strange women, and thine heart shall utter perverse things.*" In the original the word "women" is not found, but has been supplied by many interpreters. But נָרִית certainly includes *strange women*, and the state of intoxication which is here described certainly does not exclude what the English words say, as voluptuousness is often kindled and fanned into flame by the influences of strong drink.

Prov. 1, 10: "*My son, if sinners entice thee, consent thou not.*"

The word here rendered *sinnners*, הַטָּמִים, stands for those who have by continued practice become accustomed to, or adepts in, sin, in whom sin has grown into a vice, *Lasterknechte*, and the wise man warns his son not to have intercourse with such. This warning is all the more appropriate, as those who are given to any vice are generally very prone to enticing others to become their associates, and especially such as are yet uninitiated into the ways of sin with which their seducers are familiar. Very often those whom they have singled out for their victims are very little aware of the danger which threatens them; and this is vividly pictured in the form, אַל-תִּבָּא, which, like the Latin *noli!* is in the manner of an outcry directed to one who stands on the verge of a precipice with but another step between him and a fearful descent into a yawning gulf. Thus should parents and others who may be aware of the dangers to which the young are exposed by intercourse with evil men and women raise their warning voices, and those who hear such warning should *speedily* heed it, lest they be precipitated into an abyss of sin and shame and even everlasting perdition.

A. G.

## Historical Theology.

---

### THE CENSUS IN THE DAYS OF HEROD.

*And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed. And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria. And all went to be taxed, every-one into his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; because he was of the house and lineage of David: to be taxed with Mary his espoused wife.<sup>1)</sup>* This passage from the gospel according to St. Luke has given rise to an extensive literature, exegetical and historical, not only in commentaries on the third gospel and in comprehensive historical works, but also in the form of monographs, large and small. In some of these treatises a vast amount of historical and critical erudition has been massed together, and there is perhaps no position,

---

NOTE. — It is understood that when we speak of years Before Christ (B. C.) and After Christ (A. D.) we give the figures according to the Dionysian era, which is based on the supposition that Christ was born in the year preceding the year 1<sup>st</sup> of that era. It is furthermore understood that our present purpose is not to ascertain the precise year in which Christ was born, which may be differently determined according as the relative dates of Herod's death, the building of the temple, the accession of Tiberius, and other epochal events, may be differently determined. We deal with the statements of Luke as he makes them. For numerous details which we have left unnoticed in this treatise we refer the reader to Dr. Ramsay's recent work, "*Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?*"

1) Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, ἐξῆλθε δόγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου, ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. Αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου. Καὶ ἐπορεύοντο πάντες ἀπογράφεσθαι, ἕκαστος εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν. Ἀνέβη δὲ καὶ Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρέτ, εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, εἰς πόλιν Δαυὶδ ἣτις καλεῖται Βηθλεὲμ, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατρὸς Δαυὶδ, ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαρτᾷ τῇ μεμνηστευμένῃ αὐτοῦ.

possible or impossible, which has not been occupied by some one among the many who have busied themselves with the questions clustering around this text. It may be said with some safety that no text of equal compass has been more destructively dealt with from historical points of view and with historical arguments than these statements of St. Luke. In fact there is not one single detail in the entire passage, the historical truth of which has not been either called into question or flatly denied. It has been denied that Augustus ever ordered a census of the whole Roman empire. It has been denied that even if such a census had been ordered in the days of Augustus it would have included a census of Palestine, which, it is said, was not under the authority of Augustus but an independent kingdom. It has been denied that the census here referred to was the first of a series. It has been denied that it was made at the time when Jesus was born. It has been denied that this census was made under Cyrenius. It has been denied that the birth of Jesus occurred while Cyrenius administered public affairs in Syria. It has been denied that a Roman census would have caused everyone to go into his own city. It has been denied that a Roman census would have induced Mary to appear at the place of enrolment together with her husband. It has been denied that Christ was born at Bethlehem. And finally it has been denied that Luke ever made any of these statements at all, the entire second chapter of his gospel and the greater part of the first being declared an interpolation. And it is remarkable that several of these denials are found in the learned treatises of such as earnestly endeavored to refute the arguments of others who assailed the truth of Luke's narrative. Thus Dr. Ph. E. Huschke, for many years the leading man in the Breslau Synod, says in his work on this subject: "*Wie also die Kriegführung mit der Zeit immer mehr von dem Persönlichen zu dem Materiellen herabgestiegen ist, so haben auch die Feinde des Christenthums in neuester Zeit zur Artillerie und Minirkunst ge-*



griffen; sie haben den Versuch gemacht, mit dem Boden der evangelischen Geschichte den darauf ruhenden Glauben mit einem Mal in die Luft zu sprengen und den Raum, den bisher geschichtlich lebendige Gestalten einnahmen, mit dem Pulverdampf des Mythos zu erfüllen. . . . Da nun die Vertheidigung sich naturgemäss nach dem Angriff richtet, so kann dem hier in Frage stehenden ohne Zweifel auch wieder im Einzelnen — obgleich dies nicht die einzige Art der Vertheidigung ist — wirksam entgegengetreten werden. In den folgenden Blättern soll dies hinsichtlich eines Punktes geschehen, auf dem die zerstörende Kritik besonders gesicherte Lorbeeren errungen zu haben glaubt, und der sich deshalb besonders dazu zu eignen schien, als ein *instar omnium* behandelt zu werden.”<sup>1)</sup> And yet the author says: “*Lucas sagt: Ἀπὸ τῆς ἡ ἀπογραφῆς πρώτης ἐγένετο ἡ γερουσίαν τοῦ Συρίας Κυρηνίου*, das im Allgemeinen so, wie die Vulgata und Luther übersetzt haben, scheint verstanden werden zu müssen: ‘*Haec descriptio prima facta est a praeside Syriae Cyrino,*’ oder: ‘*Diese Schatzung war die allererste, und geschah zu der Zeit, da Cyrenius Landpfleger in Syrien war.*’ Dieser Sinn steht aber mit der Geschichte im Widerspruch, wie sich aus folgender Zusammenstellung der wichtigsten einschlagenden Thatsachen ergeben wird.”<sup>2)</sup> The Lutheran Commentary says: “Quite a number, including Uscher, Calovius, Storr, Tholuck, Huschke, and Wieseler, evidently trying to meet a chronological difficulty, translate: ‘This taxation (or enrolment) occurred sooner than (or much earlier than) Quirinus.’ . . . The difficulty arises from the fact that the time when Quirinus was governor of Syria was about ten years later — 6 to 11 A. D. — than the accepted time of Jesus’ birth. In view of this some do not hesitate to say that Luke was mistaken and is here in

1) “Ueber den zur Zeit Jesu Christi gehaltenen Census.” Breslau, 1840. pp. VI f.

2) Ibid. pp. 59. 60.

error. . . . Doubtless our difficulty in determining this difficulty arises from our ignorance, not from our author's.''<sup>1)</sup>

There is not, however, in our day any necessity for confessing ignorance concerning the historical evidence whereby Luke can be shown not only to be historically correct in all his statements, but even that this passage from the third gospel furnishes a key for the understanding of certain historical matters, some of which have but recently come to the knowledge of secular historians.

The first statement in Luke's narrative of the birth of Christ is this: 'Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, ἐξῆλθεν δόγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου, ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, it came to pass in those days there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled. The days of which the evangelist speaks are the days of Herod, the king of Judaea.<sup>2)</sup> And he says that at some time during the reign of king Herod, which began *de jure* during the 184. Olympiad, or, B. C. 40, and ended B. C. 4, there appeared a decree of Augustus, ordering an enrolment of the *πᾶσα οἰκουμένη*, the whole Roman empire. It should be noted that the form employed by Luke is not *ἀπογραφῆναι* or *ἀπογράψασθαι*, but *ἀπογράφεσθαι*, not the aorist but the present tense. That Luke, or the Holy Spirit, knew what he was about when he employed this form is to us no matter of doubt; but it is substantiated by the fact that in the fifth verse, where a special act or process of enrolment is signified, he uses the aorist, *ἀπογράψασθαι*. As distinguished from the aoristic infinitive, which denotes a single, definite occasion, the present infinitive indicates a lasting or stationary arrangement, a continuous action, an established order of things, or an act or process which is to be repeated.<sup>3)</sup>

---

1) Baugher, Annotations on the Gospel According to St. Luke. 1896. pp. 35 to 37.

2) Luke 1, 5. Matt. 2, 1.

3) Thus the aorist is used Matt. 19, 3. Mark 14, 31. Acts 4, 16; the present infinitive Acts 16, 21; 5, 29. Luke 16, 13; al.

What the author says is not that Augustus at a certain time ordered a certain census to be once made in a certain year, but that at a certain period the emperor issued a decree whereby he established a system of enrolments to be regularly made throughout the Roman world. That at some time such a series of enrolments was introduced was known in the second century to Clement of Alexandria, who speaks of the time *ὅτε πρῶτον ἐκέλευσαν ἀπογραφὰς γενέσθαι*, when they first ordered enrolments to be made, and says that this was *ἐπὶ Αὐγούστου*.<sup>1)</sup> Of course it might be said that Clement in these statements follows the authority of Luke, to whom he refers in the context; and perhaps he does, as many have done before and after him and as we do to-day. But if he did he certainly understood Luke as we do, taking him not to speak of a single census, but of a series or system of enumerations first begun in the days of Augustus.

The question then is: Have we any evidence besides that of Luke and of sources depending on Luke, of a permanent system of regular numberings in the Roman empire, extending from the time of Herod to a later period of history? This question, ten years ago, would have been answered in the negative, and even our interpretation of the words of Luke might have been hooted down as unwarranted and fanatical by those who have accustomed themselves and others to look upon Luke as ignorant of Greek grammar as well as Roman history. The situation, however, has undergone a thorough change in the last decade of the century now drawing to its close. In 1893 a remarkable discovery was announced, nearly contemporaneously, by three different scholars, Kenyon, Viereck, and Wilken,<sup>2)</sup> a discovery which,

---

1) Strom. I, 22.

2) Not theologians. We have been for years accustomed to find the contributors of historical evidence in favor of the credibility of Luke and other biblical writers among non-theologians, men who are not *a priori* determined that the historical statements of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are at least suspicious and probably wrong.

taken together with historical evidence previously known, reveals a system of enrolments made at regular intervals of fourteen years and extending in a continuous line from the reign of Augustus to A. D. 230. The newly discovered evidence consists, not in secondary statements made by some early historian, or in an inscription of doubtful origin and reliability, but in a multitude of original enrolment papers made out by heads of families and delivered to the proper officials from eighteen-hundred to upward of two-thousand years ago. These original documents were found among the papyri recovered from the rubbish of Egyptian graves and ruins. They are throughout essentially alike in form and contents, stating the names of the officers with whom they were filed by the parties who made them out, their places of residence, giving even the part of the house and yard occupied, the names and ages of the members of the household, including even boarders and lodgers, and the year in which each census was made. The returns are made out in Greek, and the very words employed by Luke, ἀπογράφεσθαι and ἀπογραφή, are used in these papers throughout. The enumerations to which the papers about which we are particularly concerned belong are termed ἀπογραφαὶ κατ' οἰκίαν, household enrolments. The periodic years covered by these census returns are A. D. 230, 216, 202, 174, 160, 146, 132, 118, 104, 90, 76, 62 and 20; other sources, to be specified later on, supply the enrolments of the cyclical years A. D. 48, 34, 6 and B. C. 8 or 9. This gives us a continuous series of enrolments extending, at regular intervals of fourteen years, from the year A. D. 230 back to the enrolment in which Jesus was numbered and which, as shall be shown, was for certain reasons delayed in Palestine to a later year.

From these household enrolment papers we must distinguish another kind of census returns found among the Egyptian papyri, which, like our annual tax returns, give the valuation of the taxable property of those by whom the

returns were made. It thus appears that in the Roman empire there were regular periodic enrolments in cycles of fourteen years, answering to our ten-years-cycles in the United States census, and valuations answering to our annual reports and valuations for the assessment of taxes. The words ἀπογράφεσθαι and ἀπογραφή are used also in the papyri of the latter class. Hence as far as these words are concerned Luke might refer to either the household enrolments or to a tax census proper. But the circumstances of the case at issue clearly indicate that the occasion which caused Joseph and his wife to go to the place which was the ancestral home of the family was not a tax valuation but a numeration of the families or, as the papyri give it, an ἀπογραφή κατ' οἰκίαν, a household enrolment.

That for upward of two hundred years there existed under the Roman emperors a regular system of enrolments can no longer be questioned. But to bear out Luke by corroborative historical evidence in still another point we must answer the question, Who inaugurated and established this system of enrolments? Was it Augustus, as Luke says? Clement of Alexandria, in the second century, expressly says it was Augustus. But Clement may again have relied on the authority of Luke. If he did he certainly treats Luke's statement as out of controversy, finding no cause of modifying what he evidently takes as an acknowledged historical fact, that at the time of Augustus not only a single census was ordered but orders were issued that thenceforth there should be regular ἀπογραφαί. But we can very well do without the testimony of Clement, a man of considerable historical learning. If, as the papyri show it to be, these enrolments were a permanent measure of Roman policy, it is *a priori* probable that it was inaugurated by Augustus, the great organizer of the Roman empire. It is, furthermore, remarkable that the series of fourteen-years-cycles, if carried backward but a few steps from where the earliest papyrus hitherto discovered leaves it, over the periods as-



certained from other sources, will lead us step by step, over the cyclical years A. D. 6 and B. C. 9 to the year B. C. 23, the year in which Augustus obtained the tribunician power and from which, in all the inscriptions, his imperial rule is dated. Besides, we know from the papyri that the system was regularly carried out in Egypt, and we know that Augustus paid very particular attention to Egyptian affairs. And now, here is Luke expressly stating what without his statement would be of a probability little short of certainty. Even if Luke were silent on this point the question would be perfectly in order, If Augustus did not introduce this system of enrolments, who in the world did? And if an explicit statement like that of Luke were to-day discovered, not in Luke but on some stone slab from the ruins of an Asiatic city, or on a papyrus scrap without the name of any author, it would doubtless be received as valuable and conclusive testimony to a most reasonable assumption and published in all the next issues of historical periodicals the world over.

This point being also settled, we proceed to the next question. Was the system of household enrolments established by Augustus designed for the whole Roman world? That is what Luke says: *Ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην*. The Egyptian papyri are, strictly, conclusive evidence only for the enrolments made in Egypt. Why were not similar census papers preserved in other parts of the empire? We answer, simply because, owing to its peculiar climate with its continually dry atmosphere, Egypt is the country where those ancient papyri were preserved at all, while in other countries with less favorable climates they were naturally destroyed, turned into dust, by the disintegrating influences to which they were exposed. The only *libellus* whereby a Christian suspect in the days of Decius, a certain Aurelius Diogenes, established his heathen or apostate character, proving that he had offered sacrifice, was also brought from Egypt and discovered by Dr. Krebs in Berlin, in 1893. Does

this mean that no *libelli* were written in other parts of the empire, or that the Decian persecution was restricted to Egypt? We know better from Cyprian's treatise *De Lapsis* and other sources. And, likewise, we know from Luke and other sources that the enrolments first ordained by Augustus were not restricted to Egypt but carried out in other parts of the empire.

The fifth periodic year in the course of the fourteen-years-cycles was A. D. 48. In that year a census was held in Italy. This was not a mere valuation for the assessment for taxes, but a household enrolment, and one of a series; for when a citizen of Bononia, Fullonius, had in this census under Claudius given his age at 150 years, the emperor had the statement verified from the returns of earlier enrolments.<sup>1)</sup> Concerning the census taken fourteen years earlier, A. D. 34, we learn from Tacitus<sup>2)</sup> that it caused an insurrection in Cilicia Tracheia, a dependency of Syria, and the governor of Syria, Vitellius, sent the legate Trebellius with 4000 legionaries and auxiliary forces to quench the disturbance. The census for the cyclical year A. D. 6 was, according to Josephus, made by Quirinius in Syria, where he was governor from A. D. 6 to 9, and an inscription discovered and rediscovered in Venice gives the name of the officer, Aemilius Secundus, who, "*jussu Quirini*," by order of Quirinus, made the census of the city of Apameia, enrolling 110,000 persons. Huschke says the tombstone bearing this inscription has disappeared. So it had, and the inscription was for years considered a forgery made to bolster up Luke; but the demolition of a house in Venice led to the rediscovery of a part of the slab and its inscription.

But now we come down to the census which concerns us most. The periodic year which this enrolment was to cover, according to the fourteen-years-cycles, was the year

---

1) *Collatis censibus quos ante detulerat . . . verum apparuit.* Plinius, Nat. Hist. VII, 49. Cf. Tacitus, Ann. XI, 25.

2) Ann. VI, 41.

9 B. C., and, as the time for the taking of a census was, as a rule, at the end or soon after the expiration of the cyclical year, the numeration taking in the children of the year 9 would have been the year 8 B. C. In that year, or in the year before, Titius, governor of Syria, was succeeded in that office by Sentius Saturninus, who again was succeeded in 7 B. C. by Quinctilius Varus. And now we find in the book written against Marcion by Tertullian, a Carthaginian lawyer, who for a time lived in Rome, the occasional remark that "at this time enrolments were made under Augustus in Judaea by Sentius Saturninus.<sup>1)</sup> This statement is very remarkable in various ways. It is clear that Tertullian can not, in saying what he says, have followed Luke, for he seems rather to contradict him. Luke says nothing of Sentius Saturninus, but names Quirinius as the officer during whose administration the census was made in Judaea. And yet Tertullian speaks of the enrolment during which Christ was born, whose contemporaries, he says, might have searched out his family from these returns.<sup>2)</sup> How can this discrepancy be reconciled? Very simply in one respect, and not at all in another. Tertullian was familiar with the system of enrolments introduced by Augustus, as every lawyer of his day certainly was. It took him only a few moments to figure back from one of the enrolments of his own time to the periodic year 9 B. C., and any list of the governors of Syria would give him Sentius Saturninus as the governor of that period, if he had any need of inspecting it. Tertullian, dealing with Marcion, who had stricken the opening chapters of Luke from his gospel,<sup>3)</sup> meets him on secular ground in this point, not following, but, at least apparently, at variance with, the statement of Luke. But according to both Luke and Tertullian there

---

1) Sed et census constat actos sub Augusto nunc in Judaea per Sentium Saturninum. Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem*, IV, 19.

2) Apud quos genus eius inquirere potuissent. Tertullian *ibid*.

3) Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* IV, 7.

was an enrolment in Syria in or soon after 8 B. C., when the returns of the period beginning with 9 B. C. were in order.

Thus, then, we have the independent testimony of several respectable witnesses to show that the periodic enrolments ordained by Augustus were not restricted to Egypt but extended over other parts of the empire in Europe and Asia. Thus Luke is seen to be in full agreement with history, or rather, other reliable historical evidence agrees with the testimony of Luke when he says that "there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled."

But Luke continues: *Ἀπὸ τῆς ἡ ἀπογραφῆς πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡ γερουσιεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου*, *this enrolment was made first while Quirinius was administering Syria*, or in other words, of this series of regular numberings the first was the particular census which was taken while Quirinius was in charge of Syria. The next question then is: When was Quirinius in charge of Syria?

Among the thousands of historical remnants of early days preserved in the Lateran museum at Rome there is a fragment of marble which was found near Tibur in 1764 and bears part of an inscription which, in its complete form, must have contained the leading data of the public career of a noble Roman, a contemporary of Augustus, whom, as the title "*Divus*" applied to Augustus indicates, he must have survived, and during whose reign he administered public affairs in Syria, having also been proconsul in Asia, a conqueror who was for his achievements rewarded with two *supplicationes* and the pomp of triumphal honors. The part of the inscription which contained the name of this man is lost; but for various reasons it appears that the only personage to whom all that is said in what remains of the inscription can apply is Publius Sulpicius Quirinius, who was governor of Syria A. D. 6 to 9 and, according to Strabo, conquered the Homonadenses, a warlike tribe in the moun-

tain regions between Phrygia, Cilicia and Lycaonia, a feat for which he was entitled to the honors mentioned in the inscription. This inscription, in a restoration, runs as follows:

*Legatus pro praetore Divi Augusti Syriacas legiones obtinens bellum gessit cum gente Homonadensium quae interfecerat Amyntam Galatarum regem, QUA REDACTA IN POTESTATEM IMP. CAESARIS AUGUSTI POPULIQUE ROMANI, SENATUS DIS IMMORTALIBUS SUPPLICATIONES BINAS OB RES PROSPERE AB EO GESTAS, ET IPSI ORNAMENTA TRIUMPHALIA DECREVIT, PROCONSUL ASIAM PROVINCIAM OPTINUIT, LEGATUS PR. DIVI AUGUSTI ITERUM SYRIAM ET PHOENICEN PROVINCIAM OPTINENS REGNUM ARCHELAI IN PROVINCIAE FORMAM REDEGIT.*<sup>1)</sup>

From Josephus<sup>2)</sup> we know that Quirinius was governor of Syria after the banishment of Archelaus. This was A. D. 6, ten years after the death of Herod, who died in 4 B. C. During this administration, from A. D. 6 to 9, Quirinius conducted a census in Syria, the census also mentioned by Gamaliel<sup>3)</sup> in his address to the synedrium. But this can not be the census of Luke 2, 1 ff., since that was in the days of Herod.<sup>4)</sup> We must, therefore, enquire after an earlier administration of Quirinius in Syria. The tiburtinian inscription, if, as we assume, it speaks of Quirinius, ascribes to him a second term in that province, ITERUM SYRIAM, etc., and we naturally ask, When had he served his first term of public service in Syria? We know that Saturninus succeeded Titius in 9 B. C., and was again succeeded by Varus in 7 B. C. in the governorship of Syria, and that Varus was in office till after the death of Herod in 4 B. C. This leaves no room for a first administration

---

1) The capitals indicate the parts of the inscription preserved, the italics, the parts supplied.

2) Ant. Jud. XVII, 13. XVIII, 1. XVIII, 2.

3) Acts 5, 37.

4) Luke 1, 5; 2, 1. Matt. 2, 1 ff.



of both the internal and external affairs of Syria for Quirinius during the time of Herod's reign. On the other hand the inscription shows that its hero was rewarded by twofold triumphal honors earned before his second administration of Syria, honors which were awarded to chief commanders who by armed conquest established the Roman rule in conquered territory. It was just such a task as the subjugation of the Homonadenses, an enterprise which might well occupy a Roman army in the campaigns of two years, whereby a Roman general might secure the insignia of a double triumph. And now, Strabo, the geographer of the Roman world, expressly tells us<sup>1)</sup> that Quirinius subdued the Homonadenses, a warlike people in the wild mountain regions of the Taurus, who, beside their capital city, according to Pliny, held 44 fortified towns. Again, Tacitus expressly says that in consideration of this conquest he was awarded the *insignia triumphi*,<sup>2)</sup> and that all this was after the consulate of Quirinius and before he was made the tutor of Gajus Caesar. The pacification of the South Galatian districts adjoining the Syrian province by Cornutus Aquila was, according to the evidence of coins and inscriptions and other sources, going on about 6 B. C., and the efforts to subdue and punish the Homonadensian mountaineers, whose territory extended into the Galatian province, by the commander of the imperial forces in Syria, most probably went hand in hand with those operations. It was at this time that the great public roads and a chain of fortresses were built, which were to facilitate the movements and strengthen the position of Roman armies in these subdued districts. Now, there is no reason whatever to prevent the assumption that, while, according to Strabo and Tacitus, Quirinius was the military *legatus Augusti* in Syria, conducting the conquest

---

1) Geogr. Lib. XII.

2) Expugnatis per Ciliciam Homonadensium castellis insignia triumphii adeptus. Ann. III, 48.

of the Homonadenses, another representative of the emperor was in charge of the civil affairs of the province. Thus, in later days, while Mucian was governor of Syria, Vespasian was in charge of the military operations in Palestine, and Tacitus calls him *dux*,<sup>1)</sup> which in Greek would be ἡγεμών, and in this capacity he was, as Tacitus also indicates, *legatus* of the emperor. Again, during the governorships of Ummidius Quadratus and Cestius Gallus in Syria, Corbulo, "who for so many years had been acquainted with the soldiers and the enemies," was the military commander in the operations against the Parthians and Armenians.<sup>2)</sup> Thus also it appears that Quirinius was in charge of the military affairs in Syria while Sentius Saturninus or Quinctilius Varus was the civil governor of that province and while the first of the enrolments of Augustus was in process in Judaea. In this capacity Quirinius, the *dux* or ἡγεμών, was *legatus Augusti*, just as the civil governor with whom he shared the administration of the province, though being in charge of the military affairs only. And thus the words of Luke: Ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου, fully apply to Quirinius in the position described.

From what has already been said it is not difficult to decide which of the two governors named was associated with Quirinius in the administration of Syria. We know from Tertullian what would be fairly certain without him, that the census for the periodic year 9 B. C. was made in Syria under Sentius Saturninus, who was in office from 9 to 7 B. C. His successor, from 7 to 4, was Quinctilius Varus, a man without large military experience and, therefore, not very well prepared for an arduous military task as the war with the people in the wilds of the Taurus and the strategic regulation of frontier regions would prove to be.

---

1) Syriam et quattuor legiones obtinebat Licinius Mucianus. . . . Bellum Judaicum Flavius Vespasianus (ducem eum Nero delegerat), tribus legionibus administrabat. Hist. I, 10.

2) Tacitus, Ann. XV, 23 ff.

Thus we will hardly go wrong when we assume that Quirinius was military governor of Syria while the internal affairs of the province were administered by Quinctilius Varus. That Luke should specify this period by naming Quirinius and not Varus as the ἡγεμὼν in Syria during the closing years of Herod's reign in Judaea is easily explained. Quirinius was a name well and honorably known throughout the empire. He had triumphed in Rome, laden with military honors. He was entrusted with the tutorship of an imperial prince under exceptionally difficult circumstances. He was the husband of a lady who had been engaged to another imperial prince, and his divorce suit after twenty years of married life with Domitia Lepida was for a time a *cause célèbre* in Roman society.<sup>1)</sup> Besides, the administration of Quirinius was probably shorter than that of Varus; for the Cilician war was probably in 6 and 5 B. C., and at the death of Herod in 4 Varus was in military command himself, putting down the troubles arising after Herod's death. And thus Quirinius was among all the public men available most appropriate for a precise determination of the time when the census was taken in Judaea, and thus Luke's statement is that of a precise and most judicious historian.

But why was not the population of Palestine enrolled under Sentius Saturninus? This question, too, can be satisfactorily answered.

It was a difficult thing to hold a public position at all under Augustus, and it was a difficult thing to hold a public position at all in the land of the Jews; but the most difficult position conceivable in those days was that of a king of the Jews under Caesar Augustus. And this was the position of Herod when the census for the cyclical year 9 B. C. was to be taken. That the system of enrolments was not inaugurated as a measure of universal application throughout the

---

1) Tacitus, Ann. III, 23. 48.

empire as early as 29 B. C., immediately on the accession of Augustus to the tribunician power, is not only clear from the explicit statement of Luke, but would be a reasonable assumption without such information. Universal measures of public policy are not introduced at haphazard by so careful a ruler as Augustus was. Household enrolments were probably originally an Egyptian institution of long standing, as old papyri seem to show. But when the first period of fourteen years in Augustus' principate were over, the emperor, by a decree, ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, made this a general measure for all parts of the empire. Palestine, too, was a part of the empire. Herod, the king, was a subject of Augustus, and bound to obtain the emperor's sanction for important acts. An apparent neglect of this duty in his invasion of Arabia brought down upon him the anger of Augustus, who, among other hard things, wrote to Herod, that, having formerly treated him as a friend, he would thenceforth use him as a subject.<sup>1)</sup> What better opportunity than the census could the emperor find to make good his word? Herod, a subject, his people, subjects—thus would they appear in the census returns. But the census might mean more than that for Herod. It might mean serious trouble in Palestine. The king had always endeavored to pick his way between Scylla and Charybdis, a jealous sovereign and a proud and headstrong people, chafing under the Roman yoke. What if that yoke should now be made to weigh more heavily on Jewish necks? We know and can understand that Herod sent an embassy and another to Rome in those days, and still another before he succeeded in regaining the emperor's favor.<sup>2)</sup> The first and second embassies did not even gain a hearing, and the presents they bore were rejected. It is probable that they had orders to ask for a suspension of the census in Palestine. If they

1) Γράφει πρὸς τὸν Ἡρώδην, τάτε ἄλλα χαλεπῶς, καὶ τοῦτο τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τὸ κεφάλαιον, ὅτι πάλαι χρώμενος αὐτῷ φίλῳ, νῦν ὑπηκόῳ χρήσεται. Joseph. Ant. XVI, 15.

2) Joseph. Ant. XVI, 15—17.

had, they failed of success. The census was delayed, but could not be obviated. Other parts of Syria had been enrolled under Sentius Saturninus in 8 B. C. Varus and Quirinius came, and with them a strong administration of Syria. The emperor, still relentless, must be obeyed; the census must be taken, and we learn from Luke that it was.

But we also learn in what manner the enrolment was made. To exasperate the Jews no more than necessary, Herod made the imperial census a numeration of the population of Palestine by calling the various families to their various homes, gathering them in family reunions in their ancient family seats. Thus did he sugar-coat the bitter pill. To Augustus it mattered little how the households were grouped, provided they were all there and the returns complete. In a small country like Palestine Herod's plan was feasible without affecting the reliability of the census. That the Romans readily adapted their political measures to provincial peculiarities is well known. Thus was the first census delayed to the time of Quirinius' administration, probably to 6 B. C., but finally made, quite consistently with all the prevailing circumstances, in the manner described by Luke. Thus was the decree of Caesar Augustus obeyed in the land of the Jews. Thus all the people of that territory *went to be taxed, every one to his own city*. Thus did Joseph, the head of a household, come to Bethlehem, the city of David, being of the house and lineage of David, to be enrolled with Mary, his expoused wife. For the scepter was departed from Judah.

A. G.

---



## Practical Theology.

---

### OUR YOUNG PEOPLE.

That the young people are a very important element in the church and the local congregation is very generally conceded, though rarely appreciated as it should be. The importance ascribed to this element is generally that of future values. The children and young people of to-day, it is said, are the men and women of future days, and since they will probably be, in days to come, what they are made in their days of development and growth, they should be carefully trained and nurtured in the days of their youth. These considerations are true, and vastly more might be done to convert them into practice than is often done by congregations in general and by those to whom the care of the young and old in the church is entrusted particularly. It is because of the lack of appreciation for the importance of Christian education that a Sunday-school and non-religious common schools are considered sufficient for the early training of Christian children, or that parochial schools, where they have been carried on for years, are allowed to pass into a state of decadence, until they finally pass out of existence.

But to consider the future value of the rising generation its only significance is a grave mistake. The young people of a congregation have present importance which should be by no means underrated. A baby in the house is eminently a present factor, and very often the affairs of a family hinge about the crib of its youngest member by day and by night. The small boys of a neighborhood are the future voters of that or some other precinct; but they go a great way in shaping the present character of that neighborhood, and their presence is apt to be indicated by trees denuded of bark, and fences with a shortage of pickets, and

gates unhung, and gatherings of young rowdies hanging about the street corners or infesting the alleys and making their surroundings unpleasant for residents and passers-by. Thus also the young people of a congregation are a present element exerting a present influence, wholesome or unwholesome, in various ways. Their influence is felt in the families of which they are members. It is true, the young people are educated by the old; but the old people are also educated by the young, and the younger children grow up under the influence of older brothers and sisters. The influence of a sister is often greater than that of a father and even of a mother, and that influence may be for good or for evil. The tone of many families undergoes a remarkable change when the older children get into their teens. The rag-carpets are replaced by ingrain, and the ingrain by Brussels; the pictorial charts and three-colored prints hanging flat against the walls, by chromos and etchings hung at an angle; the paper flowers and gypsum cats and dogs on mantles and shelves, by bric-a-brac of a more refined order—and all this not so much because the tastes of the old people have changed and their means increased, but because the young people want it so. Nor is the change always only for greater refinement, but very often for a decrease of spirituality and an increase of worldliness. The old family Bible on the center-table may have to make place for an illustrated edition of *Paradise Lost*, or even of *Shakespeare* and *Byron* or *The Count of Monte Cristo*, and the portraits of *Luther* or scenes from the Bible, at least on the parlor walls, for works of modern art representing Roman baths and Turkish harems, again because the young people want it so, and the old folks may be satisfied with being graciously permitted to hang the old pictures in their sleeping room. On the other hand it is true that now and then the tone of a household is also influenced in another direction by sons and daughters ripening into manhood and womanhood, that fathers and mothers and younger brothers

and sisters are led to Christ by the word and example of older children who have learned to know and appreciate that which is better than silver and gold and this world's empty pleasures.

But the present influence of young people extends also beyond the walls of their homes and the members of the household. Young people are more largely than little boys and girls a connecting link between the family and other families or the congregation at large. A school-teacher's relations to his present pupils are influenced by what his former pupils speak of him before their younger brothers and sisters. A pastor's position in the congregation and among the older people is to a great extent what the younger people make it. The public services of the congregation receive color from the presence or absence of its young people and by their deportment during the exercises. Young people may do a great deal toward the furtherance of the interests of the congregation also by material contributions, and might do considerably more than they generally do, their income being mostly far more in excess of their actual needs than that of married people of similar stations in life. In like measure the young people of a family and of a congregation may also, and very often do, serve as the channels whereby the unwholesome influences of the world and unsound religious principles find their way into Christian congregations. The world knows full well, and perhaps better than many Christians, what the present and future importance of the young people is apt to be, and the world very largely does what Christians and Christian congregations fail to do toward turning present opportunities to present and future advantage. The world holds forth to our young people hundreds of inducements calculated to draw young Christians over to its ranks. And when we notice how, after a few years, the groups of young Christians once gathered about the altar on the day of their confirmation are thinned out and far worse than decimated, we must admit that the

world is in a deplorable measure successful in its endeavors.

And now it is certainly proper to ask and candidly and honestly answer the question: What are we, the Christian congregations and their older members, the pastors and teachers, doing by way of special provision and particular care for the young people of the church? The young people are a particular element in the church; they are an important element, and some of the best present and future interests of the church centre right in the young people of the congregation. What, then, are we doing for them particularly in proportion to their importance? As young people they have particular wants. What are we doing to satisfy them? As young people they are exposed to particular dangers. What are we doing to counteract these dangerous influences and to protect our young people from them? — Have we honestly answered these questions? If we have, then it may be proper to propose another question. What *can* we do for our young people? If we can do nothing, even that is certainly worth knowing. But if we can do something, be it ever so little, it is worth finding out. And if we have ample ways and means and opportunities of making special and profitable provision for the wants of the young people of the church, we should certainly know it and then endeavor to do what we can.

The question how particular wants should be properly met can not be satisfactorily answered before we know what these particular wants are. What, then, are the particular wants of the young people of the church?

When we speak of our young people we think of those young members of the congregation who are no longer schoolboys and schoolgirls in the elementary schools, and in most cases no longer schoolboys and schoolgirls at all. The day of their confirmation generally closes one period of the life of our young Lutheran Christians and opens another. They have, so to say, passed out of the narrower channel of the

river between whose banks they have passed in their school-days, and their young lives now widen out into a bay with shores receding more and more, leaving a growing expanse of water between them. The change is sufficiently marked even for those who have now ceased to be schoolgirls, and whose daily duties are no longer to prepare their lessons for the coming day after the sessions of the school are over and to do what little housework may fall to their lot, but who are now to spend the greater part of their days in the performance of household duties either at home or in another household. The change is greater for those who, having ceased to be schoolgirls, are now to earn their bread as shop-girls or factory-girls or in some other of the numerous occupations which have in our day been thrown open to young-womanhood. The change is considerable for those who, having ceased to be schoolboys, are now to occupy their time by assisting a father and perhaps an older brother in the work on the farm or in the shop, with a view of becoming experienced farmers or skilled craftsmen themselves. The change is considerably greater for those who are from their school life thrust out among those who rush on and about in the race and chase after the opportunities of earning a livelihood and getting ahead in the world, honestly, if it can be, dishonestly, if it must be, taking care of themselves first and last and of others only as far as they consider them necessary or serviceable for their own interests. At school the boy and the girl were members of their class under the eyes of a teacher whose duty it was to watch over their safety and welfare while in the shadow of the schoolhouse. Even on Saturdays and Sundays they were organic members of the school, and Sunday found them either with their mates of the day-school in public catechisation or with many others in the Sunday-school and its regular routine of exercises. All or most of this is now over and past. With the constraint of the school the protection of the school has passed away. And yet the young



Christian lately detached from the organism of a school is still greatly in want of both constraint and protection.

Again, the school-years which have now come to their close were chiefly devoted to the acquisition of knowledge, spiritual and temporal. The young mind was accustomed to steady progress from day to day and from week to week, and we know that the habits of years can not be laid aside upon a sudden without some disturbance, unless some equivalent be furnished whereby the physical, mental or moral organism may be kept in balance. The young mind will naturally continue to crave for mental acquisitions, and it is no more than proper that it should get what it requires. Or is the young mind to understand that the time for learning is now past and the books may now be laid aside? In that case the acquisitions of years spent at school will rapidly fade and crumble away, and much of the time and labor and expense of those years will be, perhaps irrecoverably, lost. There is, furthermore, in the human heart a longing for association. Man was not made to live as a recluse, and even the family circle is not intended to be to young or old an enclosure beyond which their interests and associations must not go. The schoolboys' and schoolgirls' associations were with their schoolmates, who are, however, schoolmates no longer. A boy past school age is not yet ripe to enter upon all the duties of adult members of the congregation, though he may from year to year learn to consider the interests of the church theoretically and practically his own and to know and feel and conduct himself as an active member of the church. But who is to guide and assist him in all this by advice and encouragement and instruction, and with whom is he to join hands and keep step and touch in his earlier endeavors toward active church membership? If left to pick his own solitary way, it is hardly probable that he will make any steady and encouraging progress in his course. And if he does not, there will be those who will show him ways and offer him assistance and asso-

ciations for progress in other courses; and forward is the watchword of youth. There is no standstill in life, and least of all in the life of young people in America.

But school-time is not ceaseless toil and study. School-time includes also play-time, hours and even days of recreation; and while young people should not pass from the toil of their school years to idle inactivity, but apply themselves to work and further preparation for work in useful occupations, they should on the other hand also continue to enjoy a reasonable allowance of recreation. In what form and manner are they to obtain this? As schoolboys and schoolgirls they had their accustomed, traditional games, tops, and marbles, and hide-and-seek, and others. What will be the recreation of those who have taken leave of school life and associations? With whom will they associate in their hours of rest and relaxation? Where will they meet with others for sociable intercourse after hours of toil and on the days of rest? Who is there to suggest ways and means of entertainment proper for young Christians, pleasant and profitable and unsullied by the filth of sin and the abominations of this world and time?

This is, in the main, the problem before us in its various aspects. By whom and how can and should the problem be solved? *By whom?*

First in order among those who are responsible for the proper care of the young people are, of course, the young people's parents, and fathers and mothers very frequently realize of what assistance the teachers of their children were to them, when that assistance has ceased, provided that they realize their own responsibility and the difficulty of meeting it. Yet the parents must not be relieved of their duties toward their children, nor must they be unduly interfered with in their performance. While the young people are under the eyes and, in a measure, under the care of others besides their parents, fathers and mothers should be held responsible for the conduct of their children not only under

the paternal roof but also as they move about in their various ways of life. In recognition of this parental authority and responsibility fathers and mothers should be informed of the doings of their children whenever such information may be called for by the conduct of the children, and when it is made it should be gratefully received by the parents and acted upon wisely and promptly. The duty of parents to lead their children the ways of godliness by precept and example should be ever anew inculcated upon them by those whom God has appointed overseers over all the flock, and enquiry after the spiritual and temporal welfare of the young people of the household should be a standing topic at pastoral visits. A timely word spoken on such occasions may go a great way toward securing desired results. On the other hand parents should not be slow in seeking the advice of the pastor and other fellow Christians when their duties toward their children are weighing heavily upon them. This is not shifting the responsibility upon others, but rather conscientiously endeavoring to perform a solemn duty imposed upon parents by divine ordinance and by the love they should bear toward their children.

Yet while the first responsibility for our young people certainly falls to their natural guardians, there are others who also have duties to perform towards them and who should be mindful of their duties. The architect of a house, the painter or sculptor who has disposed of a work of art finished in his studio, the builder of a ship which has been launched and turned over to its proprietors, will not dismiss every interest in behalf of their work when it is no longer under their hands, and any misfortune that may befall the product of their labor will strike a sympathetic chord in their hearts. Thus, and even more, should a teacher of children take a certain paternal interest in the welfare of those who were once his pupils as schoolboys and school-girls. It is highly proper that a conscientious teacher should enquire into the prospects for the near or remote

future which may be opening before their pupils as they are about to be dismissed from school, and though after their dismissal they be no longer under his daily observation and guidance, he should not easily permit them to disappear entirely from his horizon. A kind word of encouragement, admonition, and warning from a former teacher may at times prove of wonderful effect, and young people should know that whatever trouble may betide them they may always be sure of a considerate hearing and of advice cheerfully given by the teacher of their earlier years. To foster this relation of confidence should be the aim of every teacher, especially of our parochial schools, and he should make it a point never to pass by a former pupil without some word of recognition, of enquiry or encouragement or whatever the occasion may recommend, and in case of sickness or serious trouble a friendly call of the former teacher will be eminently proper and fairly certain of good results.

Inasmuch, however, as the young people of the church are a part, and a very important part, of the local congregation, the pastor, who is the divinely appointed overseer of all the flock, should look upon himself and be considered by the congregation as being by preeminence the spiritual supervisor of all the young people of his charge. They are under his pastoral care while they are schoolboys and school-girls, and this is one reason why the pastor, also where he is not the daily teacher of the parochial school, should be a frequent visitor in the nursery of the church. Then the time comes when the children, whose school life is drawing to its close, are the pastor's catechumens in their course of instruction preparatory to confirmation, and during these months the pastor should endeavor not only to impress the truths of the Christian faith upon the hearts and minds of his catechumens, but also to establish between himself and them the relation of a spiritual father to his spiritual children, of paternal care and concern on his part and filial re-

gard and confidence on their part. During this important period everything should be most carefully avoided which might lead to an estrangement between the pastor and these young hearts, and the catechumens should be dismissed from this course of preparation with the conviction firmly riveted in their minds, that next to their parents they have no better friend on earth than their pastor. Of course this relation will also fade away unless it be properly nurtured and maintained later on. To facilitate this the pastor should not dismiss his class of catechumens without having made enquiry as to the probable whereabouts of each member for the near future and the pursuits which they will be likely to follow as they issue forth in life, especially in large cities and congregations, where the individual is more apt to disappear from view than where the numbers are small. In every case it will be wise to proceed methodically in order to secure the best results of such pastoral endeavors to remain in contact with the young people of the congregation and to exert a beneficial influence upon them jointly and severally. Of such methods we shall have a word or two to say in a later chapter.

But while the pastor is the overseer of all the flock, the members of that flock, too, are mutually responsible for one another, and the flock as a whole has duties to perform toward its individual members. Thus the congregation as a body should be made to understand that there is a number of young people in the fold, and that upon the care bestowed upon those young people the well-being of the entire congregation must largely depend. The question, What can we do and what are we doing for the young people in our midst? should be ever present before the congregation. The maintenance of the ministry, the fostering care of the parochial school, missionary endeavors far and near, provision for the poor of the church at home and abroad, should not absorb the attention and claim the interest and material aid of the congregation in such a



measure as to shut out the assiduous and active concern of the congregation in behalf of its young people. The backwardness of the young people of the congregation in making the interests of the congregation at large their own may often be in a measure due to the backwardness of the congregation at large to make the interests of the young people their own. Let the congregation show that the young people are worth something to their superiors in years, who manage the affairs of the church, and the probability will be enhanced that the interest of the young people will be enlisted for such affairs of the church long before they will accede to their management. And the performance of this duty of the congregation should also be conducted methodically and with the employment of proper ways and means; and hereof also a word or two may be said in a later chapter.

A. G.

---

## RELIGION.

---

*A lecture delivered before the Lutheran students of the Missouri State University.*

---

Religion is the living relation of man to his god, wherein or whereby man is or endeavors to be at peace with his god; and the practice of religion is the exercise of the rights and the performance of the duties proper to such relation. This relation was concreated in man as he came from his Maker's hands. In his primeval state man lived in union and communion with his God and held converse with him in perfect peace. By the fall man's relation to God was changed. Instead of appearing before God to serve him in true holiness, fallen man went into hiding before God, with fear and an evil conscience in his heart. But fallen man was still man, a human being endowed with

reason and will and a moral and religious sense, not a brute void of all knowledge of a being infinitely superior to himself. Of all the heathen nations, even those in an advanced state of corruption, St. Paul says: "*That which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead.*"<sup>1)</sup> That religion is a mark of distinction between man and brute has been unwillingly acknowledged even by such as deny a specific difference between man and brute, claiming that man is a product of a process of evolution extending through ages, whereby a higher type of animal was developed from lower forms of animal life and organization. In their search after the missing link between man and brute these materialists endeavored to find some tribe of human beings with nothing that might deserve the name of religion in any sense, or in other words, some specimen of humanity human in form but void of this criterion which distinguishes man from brute. Of course they failed in their endeavors, though now and then a howl of exulting joy went up when in some remote wilderness some degenerate specimen of humanity was discovered, which, on a superficial view, appeared to show no vestige of religion. I quote the testimony of Dr. Brinton, Professor of American Archaeology and Linguistics in the University of Pennsylvania, himself a pronounced evolutionist, who holds that man in his primeval state was far beneath even the most degraded savage now living on the face of the earth. In his book, "*Religions of Primitive Peoples*," he says:—

"The fact is that there has not been a single tribe, no matter how rude, known in history or visited by travelers, which has been shown to be destitute of religion under some form.

---

1) Rom. 1, 19. 20.

“The contrary of this has been asserted by various modern writers of weight, for example by Herbert Spencer and Sir John Lubbock, not from their own observation, for neither ever saw a savage tribe, but from the reports of travelers and missionaries.

“I speak advisedly when I say that every assertion to this effect when tested by careful examination has proved erroneous.” pp. 30 and 31. And again:

“No opinion can be more erroneous than the one sometimes advanced that savages are indifferent to their faiths. On the contrary, the rule with very few exceptions is that religion absorbs nearly the whole life of a man under primitive conditions from birth to death, but especially during adult years his daily actions are governed by ceremonial laws of the severest, often the most irksome and painful characters.” pp. 37 and 38.

In a later chapter he goes into detail and asserts that prayer is “a very prominent and high universal element in primitive religions.” Among the savages of Terra del Fuego the seekers after the missing link had found types of humanity as nearly answering their ideal as anything they had anywhere discovered. But Dr. Brinton says:

“Some writers have claimed that certain tribes have been found without a notion of appeal to unseen agencies and have quoted the Yahgans of Terra del Fuego and the Mincopies of the Andaman Islands. But closer examinations prove that the priests of the Yahgans call upon a mysterious being, Aiapakal, and other invisible existences, and the Mincopies are acknowledged to have prayers at the present time.” p. 104.

And of religion as a mark of distinction between man and what he calls the lower animals the author says: “It is the only trait in which he is qualitatively separated from them.” p. 36.

While, however, it is certain that man at all times and everywhere has distinguished himself from brutes by what

may and must in some sense be called religion, it is equally certain that religion as it exists and is practiced among men is not everywhere the same, but that a great variety of religions has existed and still exists among the tribes and nations of man. And here the question arises: Is there among all the multitudes of various religions practiced on the face of the earth one which, as distinguished from all the rest, is the true religion, while all the rest are false? You have probably heard a certain story found by Lessing in the *Decamerone* of Boccaccio and embodied in his drama "*Nathan der Weise*," the story of the three rings, two or all of which were imitations of a certain precious heirloom handed down in a certain family, until the last possessor of the jewel, in order to avoid open discrimination in favor of one of his three sons and against the others, employed an artist to make imitations of the original rings, and the likeness was so perfect that ever after it was impossible to determine which of the three, if any, was the genuine ring. Thus, argues Nathan, it is with the various religions. No man can tell which is true and which is false, or whether the original true religion is at all extant. The same argument is advanced by many to-day. All religions, we are told, are good in their way, and all that is required of man is to be honest in the exercise of religion which is his by choice or heredity. Frederic the Great of Prussia declared in one of his marginal notes that in his kingdom every man might be saved according to his own fashion.

But Nathan's argument has several very serious flaws, one of which is that the various religions are not, as the rings of the story, so much alike that they can not be distinguished from one another. In fact, the differences among the various religions are so great that among many the points of distinction are far more numerous and radical than the points of resemblance upon which their being classed as religions in some sense may be based. And here again a question forcibly presents itself. It is this: Do we find

among all the numerous religions one which is so thoroughly and fundamentally distinct from all the rest that, while they may be variously classified, this one is *sui generis*, differing from all religions in its nature and in its fundamental principles? This question must be answered in the affirmative. There is one and only one religion which differs from all the rest not only in degree but in kind, not only in some incidental points but fundamentally, not only as green and blue, but as white and black and as yea and nay. There is one which emphatically and uncompromisingly affirms what all the rest deny, and as emphatically and uncompromisingly denies what all the rest assert, as the ruling principle of religion.

We have defined religion as the relation between man and his god, wherein and whereby man is or endeavors to be at peace with his god, and there is no religion which does not in some way come under this definition. Religion is at all times and everywhere on earth a relation between man and his god. The denial of God is also the denial of religion, just as truly as the denial of that which is specifically human in man. But the denial of the specific difference between man and brute is ultimately prompted by the same motive which underlies the denial of God. If man is not truly man, or God is not truly God, the relation between man and God is no longer possible, and that relation is the relation of an inferior to a superior, a sinful creature to a righteous ruler and judge. But while man is man and God is God, the leading interest of man is to be at peace with God, and this is the scope of all religions. How man is to be and to remain at peace with God, is the question to which every religion must endeavor to provide an answer. Or, since man in his present state is sinful and God is righteous, the question is in other words, how can man, the sinner, be saved? And now when we enquire of all the various religions what answer they have to give to this question, we find that one religion, the Christian religion,



clearly and distinctly teaches and firmly maintains that peace between God and man is established by God alone, or in other words, that man can be saved by God and by God only. In direct opposition to this answer and to the Christian religion, of which it is a fundamental principle, we find all other religions agreed in teaching and firmly maintaining that peace between God and man must be established by man, or in other words, that man can, and ultimately must, work out his own salvation.

If any thing is clear at all it is this, that the two principles here stated are not only different from, but in direct contradiction with, each other, and that if the one is true the other must necessarily be false. The difference between the Christian religion and all other religions is far more thoroughgoing than that between Homoeopathy and what has been called Allopathy in medicine, between the Republican party and the Democratic party in politics, between the Copernican system and that of Ptolemy in astronomy. Christianity is the religion of salvation by the grace of God; all other religions are religions of salvation by the works of man. The Christian religion is based upon and determined by the truth that *God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself,*<sup>1)</sup> that *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish but have everlasting life,*<sup>2)</sup> and that there is no salvation in any other than Christ, the son of God; *for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved,*<sup>3)</sup> that *a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law,*<sup>4)</sup> and that *being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.*<sup>5)</sup> Of all this there is no vestige in any other religion, while on the contrary all other religions are based upon and determined by the maxim, that by doing right and bringing

---

1) 2 Cor. 5, 19.

4) Rom. 3, 28.

2) John 3, 16. 

5) Rom. 5, 1.

3) Acts 4, 12.

sacrifice and practicing selfdenial, or in some way conforming himself to his god, man may and must propitiate his god in order to enjoy his benefits and forego his displeasure. Thus, also, all other religions have human priests to intercede between man and his god, while the Christian religion has only a high priest who is God himself and higher than the heavens.<sup>1)</sup> And again of the person and work of this divine High Priest, *who is of God made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption,*<sup>2)</sup> all other religions are profoundly and totally ignorant, having no place for him anywhere. The Christian voices forth his religion in words of sacred song as these,

Not the labor of my hands  
Can fulfill the law's demands.  
Should my zeal no respite know,  
Could my tears forever flow,  
All for sin could not atone,  
Thou canst save, and thou alone.

There is no religion besides Christianity which has anything to place side by side with these lines, and if they were to be adapted for use at any temple or at any shrine of any heathen religion, they would have to run something in this wise:

By the labor of my hands  
I must meet the law's demands.  
Let my zeal no respite know,  
Tears, and blood of victims flow,  
That for sin I may atone;  
This can save, and this alone.

Such strains as these would present heathenism at its very best. We know that other sentiments than these have resounded in heathen temples and sacred groves, that voluptuous songs accompanied voluptuous practices, orgies, the mere description of which would drive the blush of shame

---

1) Hebr. 7, 26.

2) 1 Cor. 1, 30.

over a modest face. Thus did the prophets and priests of ancient Greece picture their fabled paradise on high Olympus as a pandemonium of vice, ascribing to the menagerie of gods supposed to be assembled there all manner of sins conceivable, adultery and rape, murder and theft, drunken brawls and noisy wranglings, falsehood and deceit, and even practices which must not be so much as named where decency is at home. The purpose of all this is easily explained. For if the gods themselves indulged in iniquity and vice as gross as any which pollute the earth, then man, however sinful he may be, might feel himself not only justified in such lusts and works of the flesh, but even pride himself with being all the more in the likeness of the gods the more his life and conduct resembled or equaled theirs. And thus man might feel himself at peace with God, not only in spite of, but by virtue of, his sin, which would not separate him from, but unite him with, the gods. This is the true solution of all the abominations pictured in heathen mythologies and practiced in heathen cults. Thus were and are the devotees of false religions occupied in working out their own salvation, either by works of a selfconstituted righteousness as bloated Pharisees, and by sacrifices even to the offering up of their own children in the fiery arms of Molech, or in works of wantonness and debauchery teeming and reeking with the filth of sin, even to bottomless depths of grossest immorality. And now behold once more in sharp contrast with all this the one true religion, Christianity! It is the relation of a holy people to a holy God, who himself has saved his people from sin to walk before him in true holiness and to serve him in everlasting righteousness, innocence and blessedness.

But to still another remarkable and noteworthy consideration I would direct your attention. Wherever and whenever the Christian religion was assailed by, or contaminated with, error, it was in every or nearly every instance with a view of disestablishing the fundamental and

distinctive truth of Christianity, or to establish the opposite and distinctive fundamental error. When Arius denied the divinity of Christ, the attack was directed against the heart of Christianity, and if his heresy had prevailed over the faith and doctrine of the church, Christianity would have ceased to exist as the church which holds and teaches that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, and Arianism would have been but an addition to the number of religions which, knowing of no divine Savior, leave man to save himself if he can. When Pelagius taught that man by proper application might fulfill the commandments of God, that heresy was calculated to render a divine Savior superfluous, and a consistent Pelagian religion would again be but another addition to those religions which make man his own savior. The church of papal Rome is contaminated with false doctrine chiefly and most grievously in this very point that it denies the sufficiency of Christ's vicarious atonement and justification by faith alone without the works of the law. Thus the Council of Trent in the canons of its sixth session (1547) has delivered itself in terms as these:

“Whoever affirms that the ungodly is justified by faith only, so that it is to be understood that nothing else is to be required to cooperate therewith in order to obtain justification, and that it is on no account necessary that he should prepare and dispose himself by the effort of his own will: let him be accursed.

“Whoever shall affirm that men are justified solely by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ or remission of sin to the exclusion of grace and charity which is shed abroad in their hearts and adheres in them, or that the grace by which we are justified is only the favor of God: let him be accursed.

“Whoever shall affirm that justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in the divine mercy by which sins are forgiven for Christ's sake, or that it is that confidence only by which we are justified: let him be accursed.”

It is evident that these statements are not Christian but unchristian and antichristian, denying that fundamental truth of Christianity that God alone saves sinners for Christ's sake only, by faith alone, which is the gift of God, and not by works or any cooperation or contribution on the part of man. On the contrary, every heathen or Moham-medan could and would quite consistently join in these anathemas hurled against the cardinal doctrine of Christianity, thus showing that these antitheses are in full keeping with, and of the nature of, the fundamental doctrine of all false religions in which they all agree, the doctrine of man's working his own salvation. Thus again, when rationalistic theologians and their followers in modern times, some of them in glowing terms, pictured Christ as the Savior of mankind inasmuch as he had set to the world a sublime example of love, noble, self-sacrificing love, in order that by following his example we might be well-pleasing in the sight of God and prepared for life everlasting, such teaching and any practice of religion shaped according thereto was not in any true sense of the word Christian, but essentially unchristian. For the salvation thus taught and sought was again not salvation by the grace and power of God, but salvation by the zeal and works of men, working out their own salvation. And when in our day there are many who claim that their religion is the religion of the Golden Rule: "*All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them,*"<sup>1)</sup> these people by their profession declare themselves to be no longer Christians in any true sense of the word, but adherents of a religion diametrically opposite to Christianity. For that Golden Rule, golden as it is, was never intended to be a summary of Christianity, never meant by Him who spoke it as a light to show the way of salvation, and those who would make it their creed grossly abuse it and pervert its true meaning, and by such

---

1) Matt. 7, 12.



perversion set themselves down as ignorant of the very first principle of the Christian religion, that religion which is not based upon and determined by anything that we should do to God or our fellowmen, but what God has done for us and is still doing toward our salvation.

Thus, then, we understand that there is one religion on earth, the Christian religion, which differs fundamentally in its leading and governing principle from all other religions, affirming what they deny and denying what they affirm. It is, therefore, palpably improper to look upon the Christian religion as one of a numerous sisterhood of religions, differing from them, perhaps, in having and shedding forth more light of religious truth than they, while on the other hand it might borrow from them certain rays of light of which it were itself destitute. The difference between Christianity and all other religions is not the difference of more truth and less truth; but the difference between truth and error, true religion and false religion, the religion of life and salvation and a host of religions without life and salvation. The Christian religion on the one side and all the rest on the other can not be true at the same time. Either the material principle of all religions except Christianity is right; then Christianity of all religions alone is wrong. Or the material principle of Christianity is right, and then all other religions are wrong. But that a religion which would lead or prompt man to work his own salvation is of necessity vain, even the light of reason may discern, and is proved conclusively even by a single argument, the argument taken from the universality of sin. A sin committed is a sin everywhere and can nowhere be anything but sin. Now, then, if it is true what Paul says, that *all have sinned and come short of the glory of God*, Rom. 3, 23, and what St. John says, "*If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves*," 1 John 1, 8, and what Seneca says, "We are all wicked; what one blames in another he will find in his own bosom; we live among the wicked, our-

selves being wicked," and what Ovid says, "We strive after that which is forbidden," and what every man's conscience will tell him, that he is not free from sin, then every religion which leaves it to man, the sinner, to make his peace with God and work his own salvation is certainly a religion without salvation and leaves man under the curse as long as the wages of sin is death, which is forever. On the other hand, that Christianity knows and shows a way of salvation is a matter of certainty, but of the certainty of faith, by which we have and enjoy *the peace of God which surpasseth all understanding*, Phil. 4, 7. And herein again the true religion differs from every false religion, the latter being the religion of natural man, the former, the religion of regenerate man.

In view of all this it is only by ignorance or unmindfulness of the radical difference between the two kinds of religion, it is, in fact, preposterous that any man should place Christianity in a line with all the other religions of our day, calling upon the representatives of the Christian church to meet as on equal ground with the representatives of Mohammedanism and Buddhism and Confucianism and Unitarianism and to join hands with them in the religious elevation of mankind. Truth can never go hand in hand with error without denying itself, and Christianity can work the religious improvement of mankind, not by joining hands with other religions, but by openly and frankly and uncompromisingly combating the errors with which they are fraught, especially the fundamental error of man's salvation by his own exertions and works. The duty of the Christian religion is not to improve other religions but to overthrow them in the hearts of men and to do what is in its power to make true Christians of Mohammedans and unbelieving Jews and followers of Buddha and Confucius and all adherents to false religions of any kind and name. And the means whereby this duty must be performed and this end may be achieved is above all the promulgation of the cardi-

nal truth of the Christian religion, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, and that there is salvation in Christ alone, there being none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.

There is, however, still another point which I will recall from what has been said. I have pointed out a number of instances in which the Christian religion has been and is to-day encroached upon and contaminated in doctrine and practice by elements foreign to its nature and at variance with the cardinal truth whereby it is distinguished from all other religions. In other words, Christianity is not everywhere pure and unadulterated Christianity, and in some cases what passes for Christianity is not Christianity at all, but a craft sailing under false colors. Thus, Unitarians are in religious statistics and elsewhere frequently classed with the Christian churches, while it is evident that a religion which has discarded the doctrine of the divinity of Christ the Savior can not be that religion which stands and falls with the divine Redeemer of mankind, Christ, the Son of God, the Savior of sinners. In other cases the cardinal doctrine of Christianity is still the doctrine of a church, but false doctrine, and especially the doctrine of salvation by works and human cooperation, dwell under the same roof and are likewise recognized as truths and preached from the same pulpits. These churches are still Christian churches, in which souls are saved by the saving truth they teach and profess. But they are contaminated churches, inasmuch as they harbor false doctrines contrary to such saving truth. In view hereof it is no more than proper to ask: Is there among the Christian churches one church which represents the Christian religion unalloyed and unadulterated, in perfect purity? There are those in our day who will answer this question by an emphatic "No." They would call it vain presumption to claim this prerogative for any one particular church among the many who bear the Christian name.

But here we must remember that there are not a few who likewise put it down as vain presumption to claim for the Christian religion the prerogative of being the only true religion, or perhaps even to point out Christianity as the favored one among a family of sisters. And yet besides the reason already shown there is still another reason why the Christian religion may justly claim the prerogative of being the one and only true religion among all the religions of the globe. Christianity holds, beside the fundamental principle that salvation is of God alone, which is its material principle, another fundamental principle, its formal principle, which is that religious truth also is of God alone. The second principle is in full and perfect keeping with the first. If it is man's business to save himself and to make his peace with God, it is, of course, likewise man's business to find out the way and devise the means of working a reconciliation between himself and God. But if, as Christianity maintains, God, and he alone, is the Savior of sinful man, it is but consistent that it must rest with God to devise his plan of salvation and the means of its execution, and that if man should be made cognizant of such plan and execution and enjoy the benefits thereof, God must reveal to man his counsel of salvation and authoritatively proclaim and promulgate the peace which he has established between himself and man and furnish forth and administer the benefits accruing from such peace. This is even more highly consistent than that the physician and not the patient should prescribe the medicine and give the directions for diet and regimen calculated and intended to work a cure in physical disease. Thus, then, the material principle and the formal principle of Christianity must necessarily go together. Christianity is, and by its very nature must be, a revealed religion. And, furthermore, since Christianity is the only religion of the nature described above as distinguished from all other religions, Christianity is also, as distinguished from all other religions, the only revealed religion. Modern Judaism, as

distinguished from, and opposed to, Christianity is what it is, not by, but in spite of, divine revelation. Moham-medanism is what it specifically is, partly by human speculation, partly by falsehood and false pretence of divine revelation made by one of the greatest imposters the world has seen. The various heathen religions are based upon the insufficient truths and numerous errors of benighted human reason blinded in spiritual things and darkened by sin. The Christian religion alone draws its truths directly from a source given to man by divine revelation, the writings of Moses and the Prophets in the Old Testament and of the Apostles and Evangelists in the New Testament. These holy penmen wrote under divine inspiration, the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, who suggested to them the thoughts they were to utter and the words whereby they gave utterance to those thoughts. Whatever doctrine is not laid down in, and in all its parts taken from, this book of divine revelation can not lay claim to the dignity of Christian doctrine. And here again it must be said that no statement concerning the way of salvation, no doctrine specifically Christian, is found in any of the so-called sacred books of other religions, but only in the Christian Bible these truths are laid down by the spirit of God as in the first source accessible to man. Whatever doctrine pertaining to salvation is not scriptural can not properly be termed Christian. Other religions may assimilate elements from a variety of sources, and there is probably no false religion which is not in part made up of foreign elements, where opportunity for the acquisition of such elements has been offered. The Christian religion alone is thoroughly exclusive in point of doctrine, and any element not derived from the one legitimate source of Christian doctrine, but from any other source, is not an enrichment or improvement, but a contamination and deterioration of Christianity. In fact, Christianity, being a revealed religion, the religion of the holy Scriptures, can never change essentially. It is incapable of improvement.



There is no such thing as perfectibility of Christianity. Christianity is what God made it. It is established and perpetuated by the word of God and by nothing on earth besides. All endeavors to perfect Christianity result in its deterioration, and all efforts to promote it by new measures besides or in place of the revealed word of God either flow from or lead to dangerous, damaging fanaticism.

It is true that not all the various representatives of Christianity have always been true and consistent in the maintenance of the nature and character of the Christian religion in this respect. Thus the scholastic theology of the Middle Ages contains scriptural, papistical, heathen, Jewish, and even Mohammedan elements. Even among the creeds of Christendom there are those in which speculation has usurped the province of divine revelation.

And now once more, as we have done with regard to the material principle of Christianity, we propose the question with reference to the formal principle of the true religion: Is there among the various Christian churches one particular church which can justly claim to have as a church adhered strictly to this distinctive principle of the Christian religion, that all religious truth must come from God and from God alone as he has revealed it in the holy Scriptures? Again we hear the cry of, "Vain presumption!" awaiting the affirmation of this question. No church, it is said, can truly claim to possess the truth and nothing but the truth in its doctrinal standards. There are even those who go beyond this and declare that it was not the will of God that any man or any society of men, any church or part of a church, should be in possession of the truth in all its divine purity. It was a wise providence, they say, which has so disposed that we should be continually in search of the truth, gaining more light from day to day and from generation to generation. For thus the seekers after truth, vying with one another in their zeal, are being continually goaded onward toward greater perfection, and thus a con-

tinual extensive and intensive growth in spiritual knowledge is secured. But such language, whatever it may be, is certainly not Christian. Christian religion is revealed religion, and divine revelation comes to us in this world's eventide only by the written word of God. What is not there revealed will not be revealed before the light of glory shall encompass God's elect, and whatever is revealed is accessible to those who *search the Scriptures, thinking that in them they have eternal life, and that they are they which testify of Christ.*<sup>1)</sup> And now, to answer the question twice proposed, I say to the glory of God that, as there is only one among all the religions of the world, one and one only true religion, Christianity, so also there is among the various Christian churches one and one only which, viewed both according to the material principle and according to the formal principle of Christianity, holds, teaches and confesses the doctrine of the true Christian religion in all its purity and unalloyed and unadulterated with falsehood or error of any kind, and *that church is the LUTHERAN CHURCH.*

A. G.

NOTE.—We have given this lecture as a specimen of what we are offering once a month to our young people at the State University at Columbia, Mo. The lectures are not delivered on the University grounds, but in a building located near the Campus and owned by a number of students as their private property.

---

## PARAGRAPHS ON PREACHING.

The first requisite for preaching is something to preach, just as the first requisite for giving is something to give, and for cooking, something to cook. The chief reason why a brute can not say anything, is that the brute has nothing to say. When a man insists upon speaking on a subject of which he is ignorant, he will make a fool either of himself, or of those who hear him, or of both, and that is certainly

---

1) John 5, 39.

not the purpose of preaching. The first question therefore which a preacher should put to himself is: *What* will I say? Some of us have heard, and perhaps even read, sermons which made nothing so clear as the fact that the preacher had failed to answer or even to propose to himself this very question. The result of this neglect is a rambling discourse, in which the preacher says a little about many things and not much about anything. The congregation upon whom a sermon of this description has been inflicted will go away as empty as it came. And a preacher who has delivered such a sermon is like the woman with a fierce fire in the range and a great kettle on top of it with nothing in it but a gallon or two of water, which she boils to death or turns into vapor and calls it cooking a dinner for a hungry family of eight.

---

That woman's family would not fare any better if she had filled her pot with waste paper or with pebbles and sawdust, with water enough to stew, and salt, pepper, and allspice to taste. The preacher must not only have something to say, but what he would say must also be of service to his congregation. He must not only choose a subject, but also a proper subject. And here again many preachers, especially in our day, are sadly deficient. As a consequence their sermons are void of spiritual nourishment, and their congregations will either refuse to partake of their fare or fall away with dyspepsia and starvation. There is no possibility of sustaining and invigorating spiritual life by sermons on "Old Bachelors," "Old Maids," "Riding a Bicycle," "My Trip Through Yosemite," and kindred subjects. Business men and professional men have good and sufficient reason to stay away from a church where the preacher endeavors to enlighten or entertain them on subjects pertaining to professional matters and business affairs as such, concerning which he may know comparatively little, and that little wrong, and aspires to palm off his talk for a sermon.

---

Another form of the question: What will I preach? is: What does my congregation need? A preacher would exhibit very little wisdom by presenting to the inmates of a home for aged invalids an elaborate discourse on "The Education of Children," or "The Duties of Young People toward the Church," though that sermon might be a masterpiece at the proper place. Of course, there are certain truths which must be inculcated upon every congregation of Christians, the doctrine of sin and grace, of redemption and justification. "Preach the Gospel" is the charge of the Master to all his preachers. But on the other hand it may be just as safely said that every congregation has its peculiar wants, and it is the preacher's duty to know those wants and to meet them in his sermons. This is most certainly one of the reasons why Christ instituted a pastoral office, a local ministry, thus securing to the congregation a steward who, living among the household of God entrusted to his care, may become familiar with the local congregation and its individual members and to furnish spiritual food with due discrimination and adaptation. An old preacher was asked how long he had been in preparing a certain sermon, and his answer was: "Thirty years." A minister should not only consider himself preparing sermons when in his study and at his desk, but also as he moves about among his people, keeping his eyes and ears open as he holds converse with them in their various walks of life. It is in this way that he may equip himself with what is necessary for securing a correct answer to this important question: What do my people need?

---

But the question: What will I preach? should be more precisely put, What will I preach in this sermon? Of course, he will preach the Law and the Gospel. But to preach all the Law and all the Gospel would probably make a long sermon. Besides, laying down the doctrine of the Law and the doctrine of the Gospel is only part of what a

sermon should be; the doctrine should also be applied for consolation, for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. To do this properly is possible only when the preacher carefully restricts himself to certain points of doctrine judiciously chosen not only with regard to his congregation, but also with due consideration of times and opportunities. The preacher will hardly be in danger of preaching a funeral discourse at a wedding, or a Christmas sermon for Pentecost. But a funeral is not simply a funeral, but that one particular funeral, which is identical with no other and accompanied with circumstances unlike those of any other funeral past or future. It is the preacher's task to adjust his sermon to present opportunities. This is one of the reasons why a careful and conscientious minister will hardly ever find a sermon preached in an earlier year again available without certain changes demanded by changed conditions not only in himself but also in the congregation. He will feel that certain matters mentioned or even emphasized on an earlier occasion would no longer be needful or even appropriate, and that certain things passed by in an earlier year should or must be said to-day.

---

Still another form of putting the question: What will I preach? may be called for by prevailing circumstances. It is: What will *I* preach? with the emphasis on the pronoun. Some things which an older preacher might very properly say in the pulpit, some subjects which may be handled with all propriety by a man of patriarchal appearance, should remain unsaid and unhandled by a young preacher in his first official year. The pastor of a congregation may discuss matters in his pulpit which a guest, a brother minister from a distance, should not touch. A lack of judgment in this respect may be of deplorable consequence, and cases might be mentioned of estrangement and even irreparable breach between a pastor and his congregation caused by indiscretions owing to a neglect of this question: What will *I* preach?

---



An appropriate form to put the question would also be: Whom will I preach? St. Paul when he came to preach at Corinth determined not to know anything there save Jesus Christ and him crucified,<sup>1)</sup> and he went and preached Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness.<sup>2)</sup> And whom else should he preach, since to Christ all the Prophets gave witness,<sup>3)</sup> and there is salvation in no other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.<sup>4)</sup> Yet there is many a preacher whose chief purpose rather seems to be to preach the Rev. Mr. John Johnson, or whatever his name may be, to exhibit himself as a great orator, and the probability is that he will rate his success by the notice in the Monday morning paper and the remarks there published on the ornate and eloquent effort of Dr. Johnson, perhaps only equaled by the excellent music rendered by ladies and gentlemen whose real aim had also been to sing the praises of the singers. A Christian preacher should preach Christ crucified and Christ glorified not only when he has taken his stand on Tabor and Calvary and the Mount of Olives, but also when he has ascended Sinai. For even from there he should not only see the smoke and lightning on the mountain of the law, but also the pillar of the cloud and of fire in the valley, the spiritual rock, which was Christ.<sup>5)</sup> But while Christ should be the great central subject of all our preaching, many congregations of to-day might with more truth than the woman of Magdala complain of their preachers: "They have taken away the Lord, and we know not where they have laid him."

---

Every sermon should be textual. But the words of St. Paul that whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning,<sup>6)</sup> are true of every text of Scripture;

---

1) 1 Cor. 2, 1.

2) 1 Cor. 1, 23.

3) Acts 10, 43.

4) Acts 4, 12.

5) 1 Cor. 10, 4.

6) Rom. 15, 4.

for all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is first of all profitable for doctrine.<sup>1)</sup> The question, What will I preach? should, therefore, first of all mean: What doctrine will I propound to my congregation from the text of my sermon? Only when the preacher has succeeded in singling out some certain definite point of doctrine which he will exhibit to his congregation, and not until then, the preacher should consider the question: What must I preach? satisfactorily answered. If at any time he should find himself face to face with a text in which he failed to find some point of doctrine sufficiently definite to be clearly set forth, he should simply lay aside that text for the time being and choose another. In such case the defect would, of course, be not in the text, but in the preacher, and he should candidly acknowledge this defect rather than conceal it to himself and prove it to his hearers by giving them a sermon deficient in what the congregation may rightfully claim at his hands before and above all else, sound doctrine. The preacher is and should be in the first place a teacher, and if whatever is written is written for the learning of those who read, whatever is preached should certainly be preached for the learning of those who hear, and hence, again, the question, What will I preach? should in the first place mean, What doctrine will I propound to my congregation? and it is with a view of answering this question that the text should be examined.

---

What, then, if the text contain more doctrines than one? Perhaps it would not be unreasonable to take up the doctrine which is the most important in the text. You have preached on that last year? May be you have. May be you have not. Another careful study of the text may convince you that your former view of the words was more superficial than you were aware. But if your plea be true,

---

1) 2 Tim. 3, 16.

perhaps present circumstances will recommend an exhibition of the same doctrine but with a different application, or the congregation may profit by, and be thankful for, an exposition of another point of doctrine from a text, the depth of which they have never surmised. We have heard Christian people on their way from church in conversation on the sermon of the day, giving expression to their joy at having now for the first time learned to understand a certain passage in that text, though they had heard it expounded for many years. It was because a certain important truth had been brought out in the sermon where they had never found it and where probably it had also escaped the attention of the preacher in former years.

---

The sermons and postils of our fathers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries excel chiefly in two points. The first is that they keep the great cardinal truths of Christianity constantly before the congregation, so that their hearers could hardly fail to become thoroughly familiar with that which is needful for Christian faith and life. The second is that there is no word in the text too insignificant for their attention, and their penetration is often truly surprising. For these reasons the postils of these venerable preachers may generally be used to great advantage in the selection of a subject for a sermon when a survey of the text with the naked eye has proved unsuccessful. We remember having on various occasions found in an old postil the substance of an entire sermon we had heard of a Sunday morning, and material for three or more good sermons besides, all in one sermon on the same text, and a thoroughly doctrinal sermon, too. In fact the best use of the old postils may be made where the object is the choice of a good doctrinal subject.

---

Next to the text the purpose of a sermon should be consulted in the choice of a subject. Now, the chief purpose of all our preaching is the salvation of souls for the glory of God, and it is a good maxim that every sermon should contain so much of the saving truth of the Gospel that a hearer might by that one sermon be led to Christ and to the acceptance of the benefits of Christ, or in other words, that every sermon should be sufficient to save a soul. A sermon which propounds the law, and nothing but the law, is not properly a Christian sermon and does not answer the purpose for which the ministry was instituted. Christian preaching is the preaching of Christ crucified. It is true, there are some texts, especially among the epistolary lessons of the church year, which are law from beginning to end. The selection of these texts was made at a time when the proper relation of faith and works, of the law and the gospel, had begun to be forgotten in many parts of the church. In expounding these texts we must, of course, with due reverence exhibit the doctrine laid down therein, and not turn law into gospel. But just as truly as the exordium of a sermon should not be an exposition of the text, the preacher may, without exposing himself to censure even from a technical point of view, give in his exordium what he can not give in the exposition of the text, a good and even abundant measure of gospel truth fresh from the fountain, thereby preparing his hearers not only for victory over sin and death by faith in Christ, but also for a cheerful fulfillment of the law in filial obedience and grateful joy for the benefits of the grace of God in Christ Jesus. That in such cases the exordium is really the more profitable part of the sermon makes the sermon all the better.

A. G.

---

## Theological Review.

---

**Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology** by *Revere Franklin Weidner, D. D., LL. D. Part I. Introduction and exegetical theology. Second edition, entirely rewritten. Fleming H. Revell Company. Chicago, New York, Toronto.*—296 pages, bound. Price, \$1.50.

All the various methods which may be pursued in the scientific exhibition of mental or material realities of whatever kind may be reduced to two. The one is the analytical method, which proceeds from the concrete or historical quantities, from facts or other concrete objects, and arrives at the abstract or rational quantities, ideas, principles, and laws. The other is the synthetical method, which proceeds from rational or abstract quantities, ideas, principles, and laws, and arrives at an exhibition of concrete or historical quantities, arranged and rated according to such principles. These two methods may be variously combined, but can never be identified. The analytical process can never be synthetical, nor can the synthetical process ever be analytical in the same case and in the same respect. Neither can it be said that the one method were more eminently scientific than the other, though either method, or both of them, may be very unscientifically handled. Thus it is equally unscientific to base a system of ethics upon a false definition of the law as it is to construct a system of ethics from an apparatus of texts which do not contain law but gospel. In the former case the synthetical method, in the latter, the analytical method would be bunglingly employed.

That the synthetical method is generally preferred in many scientific works is due not to a more scientific character of the method, but to the fact that a synthetical treatise generally presupposes extensive analytical investigation and construction, processes which have led to the formation



of concepts and the establishment of laws and principles, from which the synthetical exhibition of the subject in hand may properly proceed. It is on the adequacy of these concepts and the correctness of these principles that the synthetical development of the subject to be thus exhibited must chiefly depend. And here lies the fundamental weakness of Dr. Weidner's work. Being in the main synthetical in plan and execution, its very first requisite ought to have been an adequate notion of theology laid down in a precise definition. But this is precisely what we fail to find anywhere in this book. The opening section of the work, it is true, proceeds from a "definition of the science," stating that "Theological Encyclopaedia is that branch of theological science itself which presents a summary view of what is embraced in theological knowledge."<sup>1)</sup> But this definition, which, by the way, is wrong, both as to the genus and to the specific difference, is theoretically and practically worthless in the absence of a correct, precise and complete definition of "theological science itself," and a careful and repeated perusal of the work has failed to reveal to us what the author really means by "theological science." In the opening paragraph of Part I, treating of "General Theological Encyclopaedia," he tells us that "theology, like law and medicine, is a positive or applied science."<sup>2)</sup> But here again we are left in the dark as to the question, what a "positive or applied science" may be. In the quotations from Bain and Cave various statements are made concerning science, but nowhere do we find a definition of science or of positive or applied science. Again, Part II, treating of "Special Theological Encyclopaedia or of Exegetical Theology," apparently proceeds from a definition of exegetical theology which is promised by the heading of § 40, "Definition and Problem of Exegetical Theology;"<sup>3)</sup> but that promise is not made good in the paragraph, which says,

---

1) p. 17.

2) p. 71.

3) p. 112.

in part, what exegetical theology *comprises*, but not what exegetical theology *is*. The purported "definition" is, in fact, no definition at all, giving neither the genus nor the true specific difference of the notion to be defined. And thus throughout the entire work the author persistently neglects to give us in a concise and complete statement what the various realities, successively taken up for consideration, really and truly are. In this respect even Raebiger (not Raebinger, as he is registered by our author throughout), whose theological positions are generally wrong, deserves favorable mention for having brief and pithy definitions of his concepts as he develops them in his *Theologik*. The defect we have pointed out as running through the entire work of Dr. Weidner imparts to the book a vagueness which is all the more conspicuous in a treatise which should rather excel in clearness and pointedness as a student's Vademecum through the essentials of theology.

This lack of precision and definiteness also appears in various details of the work. Thus the paragraphs on the significance of doctrine in religion, in Christianity and in Protestantism<sup>1)</sup> are far from doing justice to the subject, the relation of Christianity to Judaism and Heathenism and the relation of Lutheranism and Calvinism, which is not only that of more or less, but that of truth and error. The reader may judge for himself as we give these paragraphs *in extenso*.

#### § 11. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DOCTRINE IN RELIGION.

"If the teaching office is the highest spiritual trainer of mankind, it follows that only a religion which has a body of doctrine, and consequently has the office of teachers, can correspond to the idea of religion in its highest form.

"Religion has been regarded by recent writers as having manifested itself in three generic forms 1) of Law, 2) of Art, and 3) of Doctrine. *Law* defines duty without inspiring the love which impels

---

1) §§ 11, 12, and 13.

man to duty. It lays stress upon unconditional obedience and the consequent recompense, but it knows nothing of unconstrained love and enthusiasm. It is deficient in that it does not provide for the free exercise of the religious disposition. *Art* may inspire love, but the love it inspires is too vague to direct the mind definitely toward the supreme object of love, and yet more too vague to connect the heart with it. The moral element is entirely subordinate, and is not even desired to become prominent, for fear that it might injure the purpose of art. Art is deficient in not possessing the strict principles and the impelling power of the ethical. *Doctrine* supplies the truth, which moulds the mind, kindles the heart, and directs the will. It embraces Law and Art, relieves them of their one-sidedness, supplies what they lack, and directs them to their highest aims.

## § 12. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DOCTRINE IN CHRISTIANITY.

"The preceding section may be historically illustrated by the Jewish, Heathen, and Christian religions.

"Judaism was pre-eminently the religion of law, Classic Heathenism the religion of art, Christianity has unfolded itself in a faith or system of doctrine. Christ is the teacher, the Apostles were teachers, the ministry is a teaching office.

"We might express the parallels and antitheses of these three different religious systems, in their relation of these three elements of law, art, and doctrine thus:

"*Judaism* and *Heathenism* compared stand thus related, — Judaism has more law, more doctrine, Heathenism more art.

"*Christianity* and *Judaism* compared stand thus, — equal in law, Christianity has more art and more doctrine.

"Compared with *Heathenism* Christianity has more law, more doctrine, equal art.

"Heathenism exhausts its strength in the effort to construct a thoughtful and frequently artistic *Symbolism*, seeking to represent in concrete form to the senses its religious spirit. Nowhere in heathendom does the human spirit rise above natural conceptions. In the figures of his gods the heathen beholds simply the form of his own being. Heathenism is extravagant in ceremonial manipulations and changeless customs, but indifferent about moral manifestations, and unconcerned about the eternal nature of things. The great importance of Socrates consists in this, that he turned the attention of philosophy away from nature and toward man, and that he aroused reflection upon moral and religious questions (*Hagenbach*).

### § 13. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DOCTRINE IN PROTESTANTISM.

"The gauge of doctrine is the gauge of Christianity. Doctrine is more prominent in Protestantism than in Romanism, because Protestantism is more Christian than Romanism.

"Comparing *Protestantism* and *Romanism*, Protestantism has less positive law, more moral law, more doctrine; Romanism has more art.

"Comparing *Lutheranism* and *Calvinism*, Lutheranism has less positive law, equal in moral law, more art, more doctrine.

"The Lutheran Reformation in Germany bore predominantly the character of reaction against the Judaism that had intruded into the Church, while the Reformation in Switzerland (*the Reformed*) was chiefly a reaction against paganism.

"As pure Christianity conditions its elements of *law* and *art*, by its highest element which is *doctrine*, the *ministry* in its true function in the Protestant Church aims primarily at teaching men." pp. 38 ff.

This will never do. Heathenism is not the religion of art, but the religion of false gods or of the devils,<sup>1)</sup> and it is a disparagement of Christianity to say that "compared with Heathenism Christianity has more law, more doctrine, equal art," and a debasement of Protestantism to say that "comparing Protestantism and Romanism, Protestantism has less positive law, more moral law, more doctrine; Romanism has more art."

We do not know whether this misconception of the true nature of the true religion and the various false religions has influenced the author in his estimate of certain works catalogued in his synopsis of theological literature under the various heads of his book. But certain estimates put on certain works certainly strike us as remarkable in a Lutheran hand-book of theological Encyclopaedia. Thus the book on pastoral rule by Gregory the Great is lifted into relief by the following comment: "The work deserves careful study, being one of the best of its kind, useful for all

---

1) 1 Cor. 10, 20: "I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God."

times.”<sup>1)</sup> The truth is that Gregory’s *Regula Pastoralis* indeed deserves careful study, not so much as a work “bearing on theological Encyclopaedia,” but as the mediaeval text-book of pastoral theology, exhibiting a veritable caricature of a Christian pastor and affording for all times a testimony to the base counterfeit which antichristian Rome has for many centuries palmed off upon Christianity and the world for the religion and doctrine of Christ and his apostles. Another caricature of Christian theology, Schleiermacher’s “Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums,” is also very inadequately dealt with by quotations from Hagenbach and Schaff.<sup>2)</sup> The entire book of Schleiermacher hardly contains a single theological statement which does not propose or imply a fundamental error. The estimate of Spener as a theologian is also misleading. Spener did not “revive the spirit of the Reformation;”<sup>3)</sup> on the contrary he, though unwillingly and unwittingly, contributed largely toward a movement which was un-Lutheran in principle and rapidly drifted away both from the formal and the material principle of the Reformation.

But more serious than all the grievances which we have hitherto stated are the objections which we must raise against Dr. Weidner’s theological position in one of the fundamental points of Christian theology. The definition of the Bible given in § 41 of the “Brief System of Hermeneutics” is:

“The Bible is a collection of original and primary documents, either of a directly religious character, or pertaining to a history of religion.”<sup>4)</sup>

Again, in § 145 he says:

#### THE TWO ELEMENTS AND THE TWO FACTORS IN THE BIBLE.

“The Bible contains two elements—a divine and a human. The writers expressly assert that the Holy Spirit spake by them (Matt. 10: 20; Acts 2: 4; 2 Pet. 1: 21), and at the same time assert

1) p. 22.

2) p. 25.

3) p. 24.

4) p. 113.



as expressly that they spoke and wrote as independent writers John 12: 38, 39, 41; Gal. 5: 2; etc.), and each author has his own manner of expressing his thoughts. These facts prove the existence of two factors, whose mysterious union produced the Holy Scriptures. These two factors are the Holy Spirit and the minds of the sacred writers." <sup>1)</sup>

The definition of inspiration given in § 140 is:

"Inspiration is that act of God by which he preserved man from error in proclaiming the will of God by word of mouth, or in committing to writing the original Scriptures." <sup>2)</sup>

In §§ 126 and 127 the author contrasts the "false views held by many at the present day," and one of which he terms mechanical inspiration, which, he says, was the "view of the older dogmaticians," with what he considers "the true method of answering the question." Not only in justice, but with sincere pleasure we offset these quotations and references by the following statements of our author:

"The sacred writings are inspired, and their inspiration is *plenary*. The Bible as a whole is the Word of God, so that in every part of Scripture there is both infallible truth and divine authority." <sup>3)</sup>

And again:

"The Bible is the Word of God, and not simply contains the Word of God."

But statements as these, true and enjoyable as they are in themselves, lose much of their value by being bound up with such things as we have pointed out above. The definitions of the Bible and of inspiration quoted are thoroughly inadequate, and the "view of the older dogmaticians" classed with "the false views held by many at the present day," cannot but raise serious doubts as to the true import of the author's words when he speaks of plenary inspiration as a truly Lutheran theologian would speak.

---

1) p. 260.

2) p. 259.

3) p. 251.

There are other things in this book to which we would take exception; but since a complete enumeration of them would require more space than the present occasion will permit, we proceed to what affords us more pleasure than what we have deemed it our duty to say in the preceding paragraphs.

In pointing out the merits of the book we would mention in the first place the synopsis of theological literature appended to the various chapters throughout the work. These catalogues, though, as a few specimens quoted above may have shown, not always reliable in the descriptions and estimates of the works recommended, are very rich, especially in works published in the English language, originals or translations. The "Brief system of general biblical Hermeneutics" embodied in the work, being an outline of Cellèrier, contains much that is commendable. The paragraphs on Textual Criticism, §§ 73 and 74, are as good as anything we have found on the subject in the same limited compass. The paragraphs on higher criticism on the Old Testament and the higher Criticism of the New Testament, §§ 68 and 69, may find a place here in full.

#### § 68. THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

"There are three scholars which in various ways have contributed largely to the development of the negative critical views regarding the Old Testament. The first was the Roman Catholic, Richard Simon (1638—1712), who expressed independent views, especially concerning the composition of the Pentateuch; the second was John Semler (*d.* 1791), who, although of a religious and sincere character, was carried away by the spirit of the age, and introduced the accommodation theory, so popular in the present day, which tries to explain the Bible from the notions and prejudices of the times, and thus became the real Father of German rationalism; and the third was J. G. Eichhorn (*d.* 1827), who on account of his *Historical Introduction* to the Bible, has sometimes been called the founder of Higher Criticism. These in turn were followed by Gesenius (*d.* 1842) and Ewald (*d.* 1875), among whose followers, with more or less independence, we may mention such scholars as Hitzig,

Lagarde, Dillmann, Diestel, Merx, Stade, Siegfried, Wellhausen, Cornill, Kautsch, and others of Germany; W. Robertson Smith, Cheyne, Driver, and others of Europe; and Briggs, and others of America. All the articles on Old Testament subjects in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* have been written by negative critics, and the first volume of the English edition of Smith's *Bible Dictionary* has also been rewritten in the interest of negative Higher Criticism. Dr. Schaff says (§ 114): 'This school has revolutionized the traditional opinions and the origin and composition of the Pentateuch (or Hexateuch, including Joshua), the authorship of the great part of Isaiah (especially the exilic Deutero-Isaiah from chapters 40—66), of Daniel, of the Davidic Psalms, and the Solomonic writings. The doubts and objections of older scholars have been fortified, systematized, and an attempt made to reconstruct the entire history and literature of the Old Testament. . . . But a reaction similar to that in the Tübingen School will no doubt take place on those difficult and complicated problems, and has already begun in the line of the search after the older sources from which the various documents of the Pentateuch are derived.'

"But these theories have not as yet been established,—they are in fact nothing but speculations. We grant that there has been a most remarkable display of minute scholarship on the part of these negative critics, in the discussion of words and phrases in which they have often lost themselves,—but after all, the most of it is mere fanciful conceit. A scientific presentation of their marvelously complicated theories, divergent as they are, is to most thoughtful persons, a sufficient answer, and a demonstration of their falsity. In nearly all cases their analysis is subjective and opinionated and rests upon certain preconceived views which have no settled and sure basis. For several years this negative school has been making rapid progress, but the tide of battle is turning in Germany, in England, and in this country. We need but refer to the labors of Zahn, Rupprecht, and the writers in the *Beweis des Glaubens*, in Germany,—to the works of Cave, Douglas, Ellicott, Girdlestone, Leathes, Sayce, and Lias, in Great Britain,—and to the writings of Green and Bissell, in this country.

## § 69. THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

"Three different methods have been employed in time past to eliminate the divine and supernatural from the New Testament. 1) The first method is that of the German rationalists, like Eichhorn, Paulus and others, who sought to explain all the miracles by

natural causes. 2) The second method employed by Voltaire and scoffers of that class, was to deny the trustworthiness of the writings by questioning the good faith of the writers, imputing to them hypocrisy and deceit. 3) The third method is that known as the method of Higher Criticism, in which the critics denied that the New Testament books were written by the persons whose names they bear. Baur (*d.* 1860) and his followers of the New Tübingen School (Zeller, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, etc.) deny the genuineness of all the New Testament writings, with the exception of Revelation, and the Epistles to the Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans—treating the rest as forgeries of the second century, resulting from a bitter struggle between the Pauline and the Petrine parties. These rationalistic critics criticise the received views of the New Testament with the utmost freedom, and reject all the traditions of the Church as to the authorship and dates of the several books. Generally speaking, their criticism is not based so much upon the matter of the book, as upon *details of language*, and upon the critic's own theory as to the *use of words*. The later scholars of the Tübingen School, however, now concede the genuineness of all but three or four of the Pauline Epistles (excluding Hebrews), and reject the three Pastoral Epistles mainly because they cannot be easily located in the known life of Paul, and because they seem to indicate a post-Pauline state of the church government and of heresy. Strauss (Baur's pupil) turned his criticism upon the Gospels, and endeavored to revolutionize the Gospel History, but only gave stimulus to the rich modern literature on the life of Christ. The relation which the three Synoptical Gospels bear to one another has given rise to the widest difference of opinion, and the Synoptical problem is by no means definitely settled, although the writer adopts the view that all three Evangelists drew from a common source, which constitutes the foundation of our first three Gospels, and that this source was the oral teaching of the Apostles, which on account of its sincerity and simplicity, immediately received a fixed form. There are strong reasons for supposing that of the three Synoptists, Mark exhibits the oral tradition of the official life of our Lord in its earliest extant form, reflecting the fresh and impulsive temper of Peter. The fact that the first (Matthew) and the third Gospels (Luke) are two writings which are altogether independent of each other is of the greatest consequence in the further investigation of the sources of the Synoptists.

“The Johannean authorship of the fourth Gospel is still in dispute among the negative critics, but the history of this discussion

is very interesting, and teaches a good lesson to modern critics. Fifty years ago DeWette very tersely expressed the general result of the higher criticism of his day when he said: 'In N. T. criticism nothing is so firmly established as that the Apostle John, if he be the author of the Gospel and the Epistles, did not write the Apocalypse; or if the latter be his work, that he cannot be the author of the other writings.' The School of Schleiermacher ascribed the Gospel and the Epistles to the Apostle John, but denied his authorship of the Apocalypse, and this view prevailed generally fifty years ago. Then the opposite view gained the ascendancy among the Higher Critics, the view of the Tübingen School, that the Apocalypse was a genuine Johannean production, but that John was not the author of the Gospel and the Epistles. And so the change of base among the negative critics will go on—the tide has its ebb and flow.

"Schaff (114, 115): 'There is scarcely a book in the Bible which has not been subjected to the dissecting-knife of the most searching criticism, such as would disprove the genuineness of almost any ancient book. . . . Truth will slowly but surely make its way through the wilderness of conflicting hypotheses. . . . The immense labor of Christian scholarship cannot be lost, and must accrue at last to the advantage of the Church. . . . The Bible need not fear the closest scrutiny. The critics will die, but the Bible will remain—the Book of books for all ages.'" pp. 170 ff.

As a curiosity in a work on Theological Encyclopaedia we give the Doctor's remarks on the use of tobacco.

"In regard to the use of *tobacco* it may be said: a) that in any case, and to any man, the excessive use of it is reprehensible. b) Many use it to whom it certainly brings no benefit—if it has any good in it, it has none for them. c) If there be feebleness of constitution—lack of vital stamina—the use of tobacco is likely to be very pernicious, if not fatal. d) If, on looking at the whole matter, there is fixed in your mind the slightest doubt of the propriety of this practice, avoid it wholly. Whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we should do it unto the Lord, and to his glory. (1 Cor. 10: 31.)" p. 60.

A. G.



**The clerical life.** *A Series of letters to ministers by John Watson, D. D., Prof. Marcus Dods, D. D., Prin. T. C. Edwards, D. D., Prof. James Denney, D. D., T. H. Darlow, M. A., T. G. Selby, W. Robertson Nicoll, L. L. D., J. T. Stoddard. New York, Dodd, Mead, and Company. 149—151 Fifth Avenue. 1898. VIII and 257 pages. Price, \$1.25.*

Juvenal's satires were not, by their author, intended for historical essays; and yet the study of Roman society and its ways is largely indebted to these penpictures, while it is highly probable that the author's purpose of exercising an elevating influence on the morals of his day was not achieved, and we are not sure whether such really was the poet's purpose, or whether he simply meant to offer pungent amusement to the reading public of his time. The same might, *mutatis mutandis*, be said of one of the most brilliant satires of all times, Erasmus' *Laus Stultitiae*.—These *Letters to Ministers* are also a literary treat, a symposium of essays in epistolary form, wherein the mirror is held up to the faces and figures of various categories of modern preachers. It is not probable that these *Letters* will work a reform among those classes of preachers; they are highly instructive reading in a way probably not intended by the authors. They not only exhibit existing types of ministers which many Christians fortunately have never seen or heard, but the reproof and correction which they administer is of a nature which shows that the epistlers themselves have not brought to their task the proper notion of "the clerical life," and that the minister who would amend his ways according to their prescriptions would still be found deplorably wanting if weighed in the balance of St. Paul's Pastoral and other Epistles.

A few specimens may serve as an inducement to some of our readers to procure this interesting picture gallery.

Here is an extract from the letter *To a Minister whose Sermons last an Hour*:—

Among the charms of your sermons is their wealth of quotation and anecdote. My wife believes that you have learned by heart nearly the whole English poetry. My eldest son points out that your extracts are invariably taken from the "Thousand and One Gems," but, even if he is right, immense labour would be required to commit them to memory. Longfellow, who appears to be your favourite poet, is mine and my wife's as well and we never hear a verse from "The Psalm of Life" without a thrill of satisfaction. We like your habit of repeating the same anecdote in different sermons. This helps to stamp the lesson on the memory, and it must be a poor tale that will not bear retelling. Yet people complain of your extracts and your stories. Only last Wednesday one of the deacons said we might suppose, from your anecdotes about the Royal Family, that the Queen is constantly engaged in presenting Bibles to savage chieftains.— P. 47.

From the epistle *To a minister who has no Theology in his Sermons* we quote the following passage:

If you are not too angry, I will add one thing more. As a Christian minister it is your business to preach God to men. I have noticed in you and in other men who share your sympathies a certain want in this respect. You rather pride yourself on your knowledge of human nature, on your skill, won largely from the study of literature (and not to be won at all, as you tell me, from the study of catechisms), to read the heart and hold the mirror up to it: this is one of your great powers as a preacher. I grant it, but I should rather call it by another name. When you call it a great power, you mistake diagnosis—not always of the deepest—for therapeutics. What a preacher needs more even than the knowledge of man is the knowledge of God. Without this, his ability to read the heart is the gift of the dramatist or novel-writer, not of the evangelist. Jesus knew what was in man, but that was not His gospel. He knew the Father. It is a serious thing to say, and I would not say it without feeling my responsibility, that your preaching has more of man than of God in it, and that it is evangelically ineffective for that reason. Think about God, what He is, what He has done, what He has promised to man; think out what is involved in the Incarnation, in the Atonement, in Christ's return as Judge; think of it all as a revelation of God, not merely as a ministry to man, and say, We praise Thee,

O Lord, propter magnam tuam gloriam. These ancient words remind one of another thing also, which you interesting non-theological preachers are apt to overlook to your own and the common loss; viz., that the Christian Church has a mind, a language, and a style of its own, our part in which is lost unless we know theology to some extent both as a history and a science. — P. 62 ff.

*The Minister who regards himself a Prophet of Criticism* gets, aside of some concessions to which he is not entitled, such roastings as these:—

You wandered four days and part of two nights through a sandy desert of documents in order to prove that Moses could not have written Deuteronomy, and have received on an average six letters a day ever since from aggrieved members of your congregation, lamenting your fall, besides one from "A Well-wisher," pointing out kindly but firmly that an avowed atheist is hardly a fit person to be the minister of a Christian congregation. It does seem as if justice were indeed blind which crowns pious laziness with favour and thrusts honest work into the pillory, and I quite understand that you are tempted to regard religious opinion with contempt, especially if it be orthodox. — P. 106 f.

We are overrun with prophets nowadays and grotesque missions; but perhaps the most amazing prophet that ever claimed to have a mission from God is the preacher who arises to dispel the myth of the Davidic Psalms, or explain the difference between the Jehovist and Elohist documents? Where would this poor world be if that voice were silent? "Behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people!" May it not be that you are taking yourself too seriously, and that you might abandon this high walk without treachery to conscience? You have read a fair number of books, and you have a just estimate of your abilities, but one may conclude, without offence, that you are not a critic at first hand or an expert scholar. If you were, it would be necessary for you to resign your charge without delay, both for the sake of scholarship and your congregation. As you are not, it is worth your serious consideration whether you are justified in hindering your general practice by semi-amateur specialism. Unload any useful Bible criticism in your classes, and let the pulpit go free. Why should you forfeit the power of your preaching to be a sixth-rate Biblical critic?

My belief is that you are largely influenced in this unfortunate effort by the fact that a handful of skeptical people sit in your church. They are not five per cent of the congregation, but their pres-

ence makes you self-conscious and serves to deflect your thought. Something especially liberal and intellectual must be placed before this company, and you have gone hunting in the wastes of criticism for their food. Are you perfectly certain that this class will be carried captive by a Bible you treat ostentatiously as ancient literature, or that after hard brain work during the week they hunger for new problems on Sunday? Could they not read Kuenen for themselves, if this be their soul's desire, and is it not possible that they have come to you for guidance and stimulus in the spiritual life? May it not have been the soul of the Bible that has attracted these aliens, and you have dissected its body for their edification? They came for bread, although they did not say so, and, with the best intentions in the world, you have offered them a stone.—Pp. 111 ff.

A. G.

---

**Teologisk Tidsskrift.** *Redigeret af Prof. H. G. Stub. Decorah, Iowa. Lutheran Publishing House. 1899.*

The only regret we feel at the appearance of this new theological quarterly is caused by the conviction that what our esteemed friend and brother, Prof. H. G. Stub, is here doing ought to have been done long ago. The Norwegian Synod, of which the editor of this new publication has for many years been a member, is a body which comprises not only a sufficient number of ministers and educated laymen to support a periodical of this kind besides the synodical organ intended for the people at large, but also contains a number of able theologians of profound learning and ample experience and highly qualified for theological literary work. A theological quarterly or monthly might have rendered very efficient services to the Synod and its members in times of long continued controversies on fundamental points of Lutheran doctrine and contributed largely toward united efforts in behalf of a cause which was well worthy of the best endeavors of all those therein concerned. But better late than never. Though the day of *Norwegian* Lutheranism is doubtless declining and its shadows are lengthen-



ing eastward, its sun has not yet touched the Western horizon and its rays are still sufficiently bright to enable hundreds and perhaps thousands of Norwegian Lutherans in this country to enjoy the exhibition of sound Lutheran doctrine in a Norwegian publication. Besides, our Norwegian brethren certainly owe a large unpaid debt to those who have remained in the mother country across the seas, and it may be hoped that their testimony may find open ears and hearts and a ready response where the cradles of the fathers of Norwegian Lutheranism in America and many of their children have stood years ago.

The banner which is unfurled and wafted to the breezes in the first issue of the *Teologisk Tidsskrift* is that of the Lutheran church, the doctrine of the apostles and prophets and of the Lutheran symbols without limitation or curtailment. The chief end and aim of its editor and contributors, as announced in the preface of this first volume, is to champion the cause of sound doctrine as drawn from the fountain of the unerring and infallible word of God, the holy Scriptures, against all the onslaughts of modern Gnosticism sailing under the flag of Christian theology. The titles of the articles contained in the first issue of 64 pages are: "Preface," pp. 1—15. "Not two but one record of creation," pp. 15—25. "The Danish pastor Rasmus Jensen, the first Lutheran preacher in America," pp. 26—41. "An important chapter in Baptist history," pp. 42—49. "From what year does the public literary activity of Luther date?" pp. 49—52. "English Hymnology," pp. 53—56. "Reviews," pp. 63 and 64. The *Tidsskrift* is published in four issues annually of 64 pages each, at the price of \$1.00 per annum, at the Lutheran Publishing House, Decorah, Iowa.

A. G.

---



## MISCELLANY.

---

Our readers will have noticed that in the present issue of the *QUARTERLY* we have taken up a subject which is or ought to be of general interest to the pastors of our congregations, the care of our young people. What we have said amounts to little more than a presentation of the problem, the solution being reserved for discussion in a future issue. We are confident that there are those among our readers who would be better able than we are to do justice to the subject, and it is to them that we hereby come with an urgent request for their contributions toward a thorough theoretical and practical treatise on this important question. What we most desire would be a rich harvest of communications stating what those who have experience in the matter are actually doing by way of special provision for the wants of their young people, the means and measures employed and the results achieved, the difficulties to be overcome, the failures experienced and the causes of such failures, and whatever else may be deemed of interest and profit to those who are conscious of the grave responsibility resting upon them. We are not calling for elaborate and voluminous essays, but rather for material, expository, descriptive and narrative, which we might embody in a comprehensive treatise along the lines indicated in our article, and we hope that the forthcoming contributions will constitute by far the better part of what we shall submit to the consideration of our readers.

---

By far the greater number of those who have expressed themselves on the question proposed in the January issue of the *QUARTERLY* have cast their vote in favor of devoting to other reading matter the space formerly occupied by a sermon. Yet there was also a number of those who would

prefer to see the old way continued. Our own preference would be a homiletical department, devoted chiefly to sketches of doctrinal sermons, say of two pages each, several of which might appear in each issue. By this plan a wider field would be covered in less time, and the benefit accruing would be considerably greater than the advantages offered by four sermons in the course of the year. The chief encouragement toward opening this department and perhaps a necessary condition would be the assurance of their willingness to tender their regular aid by a number of brethren in the ministry. On receipt of a sufficient number of promises we would lay down a plan to be followed in the main by all contributors with a view of securing a measure of uniformity necessary for accomplishing the best results.

---

Another valuable and welcome line of contributions would be communications from pastoral life, narratives of experiences at sick-beds and death-beds, singular visitations of the grace and power of God, successful combats with gainsayers, liberations from the bonds of sin and unholy associations, late harvest of seed long ago deposited, happy arguments against current objections to points of doctrine or ethical precept, singular instances of prayers heard and petitions granted, etc. Too little has been done in our day toward gathering such experiences in permanent form, and yet there is probably no pastor even of limited experience who would not be able to contribute something well worthy of being made common property for present use and preserved for future generations.

---

There is still another collection which we consider worthy of a joint effort by all who may be in position to contribute thereto. What we have in mind is a collection of personal reminiscences from the earlier days of our Synod,

anecdotal incidents from the lives of our fathers never yet reduced to writing or print. Of course the most prolific contributors toward such a collection would be the older members of our Synod. But in many instances younger brethren are present when at conferences or other gatherings the older members of the circle tell their tales of earlier days, their reminiscences of Walther and Wyneken and Buenger and Brohm and Craemer and a great many others who have been instrumental in the building of Zion throughout the length and breadth of our country. We would be personally thankful for an abundance of such anecdotal contributions in the interest of the history of our church in America, and the time will soon be over which affords opportunity to draw from original sources unwritten material which will be of permanent value and which, if not collected soon, will be irrecoverably lost. It may not be superfluous to say that also among the old members of our congregations there are still those who would be able to furnish their present pastor with what he might collect from their lips and perpetuate by reducing it to writing and contributing it for publication in our periodicals. Our department for historical theology is open for such contributions.

---